

greatest value must be cultivated and disciplined and developed by criticism and by experimentation and by prolonged and ripened experience (underscoring mine.)

...Anyone who refuses to consider anything as God save that which he happens most to desire, is the devotee of an idol because he is not even seeking for that which truly does constitute the order of value in devotion to which all men can find community and oness of life" (223-224)

The difference between the mere will to live and the human will to maximum life is not merely a difference in animal vitality. This is made clear by the following: "To undergo great suffering and turn it to profit by making it a medium for discovery requires an enormous zest for life. There are some individuals who have this zest. They are so voracious for life that any amount of suffering, defeat and loss leaves them undaunted and daring still. They made through blood, be it their own or their foe's or their beloved's. This voraciousness is found at two levels. It is found among lower animals which ~~h~~ have great biological vitality. It is also found among some men who are so unreflective and so endowed with abundant vitality that nothing can subdue the animal urge in them so long as the heart continues to beat. But this same zest is also found at another level, where it is not due to mere biological vitality at all. There it is due to a passion awakened by a lure and not by an urge. Religion which is responsive to the compulsive lure of God gives such zest at the high level of personality." (Wieman "The Issues of Life 265-266). When we realize the distinction between the functional, the formal and the final values, we can understand more clearly what Wieman speaks of as the difference between biological urge and divine lure.

* * * *

Sunday, October 12, 1941

From the soterical point of view, character in the affirmative ethical sense is the tendency to perform any act, however insignificant in a spirit of conscious or intuitive realization of its entire, or at least the great part of its entire, context of values in terms of life abundant or salvation. The inner constitution of the individual is continually being shaped by social environment through the

medium of the values which that environment attaches to his or any one else's acts. Those values are expressed by means of approval and disapproval. The educator whose function it is to foster beneficent character cannot afford to be content with the confused, inconsistent and unintegrated mass of evaluations, or approvals and disapprovals of everything and everybody, which the average layman lives by. His claim to being either teacher, preacher or pastor is justifiable only insofar as he perfected himself in the art of directing the character development of those entrusted to his charge. If he conceives his function as being merely the transmission of a heritage, or training in any or many skills, he is no better than a horse trainer.

How the fostering of beneficent character involves eliciting the tendency to perform any act in the ~~spirit~~ spring, etc (see above) may be illustrated by means of the following from Hugh Hartshorne's "Character in Human Relations" (p. 257) which becomes an inherently logical and organic when transposed into the key of of ssterics. He speaks of the conditions which must exist for any act to become a function. The phrase "an act becoming a function" should be translated into "an act made significant by being seen in the context of the soteric scheme of values. He then goes on to say "Let us look more closely at these conditions from the standpoint of the participant. In schematic form they are as follows: "Criteria of Effective Functioning: 1. Purposefulness (practical, social); 2. Utility-Skill - Success (practical and social); 3. Joy; 4. Sense of belonging; 5 Social Spirit; 6 Perspective."

What he designates as criteria of effective functioning I term values which constitute maximum life. The categories he suggests are arrived at inductively. How can we be sure that he has not omitted some category? In the soterical approach I use the deductive method suggested by Aristotle's four categories of causes.

Hartshorne then proceeds: "These hardly need defense. Take washing dishes, for instance -- a disagreeable bit of routine as ordinarily conducted. Perhaps it must remain so. If properly learned however, should it be necessary to continue it as a household task, it might assume a larger meaning and interest."

Instead of the vague phrase "a large meaning and interest," soterics would say "it might be seen in the context of values which in their totality constitute salvation."

"The first criterion is therefore Purposefulness. Obviously the one who washes ought to realize the practical purpose of the task -- to get the dishes clean. A clear standard of cleanliness would be a real asset in some households, and make the work not only more interesting but more useful. But this is not the sole purpose. There is also the contribution to the health and happiness of the family. The second criterion is utility. Washing which does not result in clean dishes, no matter how well intentioned is not a function...Success..is essential if a mere act is to be a function...Hence skills are basic to character -- skills in doing the humdrum tasks that make up the day's work."

Let me try to disentangle the foregoing into the distinct strands of the soteric scheme of values. Purposefulness is a ^{an} ~~tact~~etological category. Whatever in it is of consequence is conveyed in the category "utility" which in soterics is the first or basic formal value. Cleanliness as an end in itself is an esthetic value and therefore one of the formal group of values. As a means to health and happiness of the family it belongs to the formal value of utility. Thus the need to have clean dishes, which like the infinite number of other needs is an expression of the will to maximum life, bifurcates into the functional value of health on the one hand, and on lthe other into the two formal values of interestingness (which esthetics) and utility which calls for skill. The aspect of skill is the conative aspect of the formal value of utility.

"Skills, however," he goes on to say, "are social as well as practical. If dishwashing, for example takes two to perform, there must be mutual adjustments, divided labor, and so on, else the job is a failure as a function, even though it somehow gets done. Everyone knows the difference between the bickering and quarrelling of an ill matched team and the smooth-running efficiency of a couple that have learned to work together. So in every joint act and in every act which involves the convenience of others, the social adjustment that include what we call tact...must be learned if these acts are to be true functions."

Transposed into the key of soterics, the point in the previous paragraph is that the act of dishwashing is necessarily a social act, since it is done as part of household work, even if it is done by one person. To be performed in a manner most conducive to one's own self-fulfilment, it should be done without irritating any member of the household, or rather with the deliberate purpose of pleasing the other members. In other words, the simple act of dishwashing can be made to meet both the functional need of acting in cooperation with others and the formal need of having such action pleasing to others.

"The next criterion is Joy. This is a natural accompaniment of successful activity which one chooses to do for reasons that are adequate to oneself. We may take it that when joy is absent, there is something wrong with the other conditions. It is a danger signal."

The suggested criterion of Joy is none other than the emotion which accompanies the awareness of having realized all the values of the soterical context. Hence when joy is lacking there must have been some disvalue taking the place of a value, thus destroying the integrity of the soterical content.

"To have full value as a social function, an act must be accompanied by or lead to what we might speak of a Sense of Belonging. This is somewhat vague but probably conveys the type of attitude we have all felt at times. It marks a moment of identification of oneself with the group with which or for which one is working...At its best it is a gentler mood which binds one to home, to team, to club, to country, to humanity, to the universe, indeed, provided one's acts be conceived with sufficient perspective."

It all becomes much clearer when we transpose the foregoing into one of the third group of values, viz: final values. The particular final value referred to in this case is that of humanity or society experienced as a fulfilment of life in a sense analogous to that in which the two other final values, Personality and God, are a fulfilment of life. Hartshorne should have stopped at the term humanity. By going into "universe" he allowed himself to be carried to the final value "God" which he tries to articulate in what he says in the next paragraph:

"Beyond this, however, there is a still more vague attitude which I have called the Social Spirit -- a poor term, but again we can pick out those who play the game in such a way as to make us feel they catch the spirit of the thing. It is in a way the antithesis of the sense of belonging, for it marks the person who stands without and looks upon himself and upon others with a detachment that places him, as a mystic might say, 'above himself.' He is not a mere creation of the group...~~When the group fails him a mystic might~~ When the group fails him and he cannot either conscientiously work with it or change its character, he withdraws from it...It is from the standpoint of an ever more inclusive whole that the fully mature character views his own acts and those of the groups to which he belongs, and this perspective distinguishes him as a man of character."

All of the foregoing becomes much clearer, if for the poor term Social Spirit we use the term God. The final criterion Perspective, as he himself says "has been anticipated," so why add it on as another category? Thus the Rabbinic saying: "Let all thy deeds be done for the sake of Heaven" finally comes to its own most convincingly in the Soterical approach.

* * * *

Monday, October 13, 1941

There is always room for a new science so long as there are phenomena which are not subsumed under the existing sciences. One such group of phenomena consists of multitudinous cases of people who put up a desperate struggle for existence against what seem to be hopeless odds and, somehow manage to win out. It makes no difference whether the odds are those of human hostility, personal handicaps or inclement forces of nature. They all exhibit man's will to live to a degree far more evident than when man is favored by friendship, health and favoring circumstances. Should there not be some science which would make a study of these manifestations of the will to live and arrive at some general principles concerning its functioning and its implications for human life as a whole? This is exactly what soterics proposes to do.

Let us take the case described in the little book "The Good Fight" which is the autobiography of Raymond Leslie Goldman, a writer of sufficient ability to

earn a fair livelihood from his stories and sketches. He writes the story of his life at the age of 39 entirely for the purpose of spreading the gospel of happiness. He wants the reader to say to himself: "If he can be happy after all he has gone through, and under such conditions as are inseparable part of his life -- what about me? And he goes on to say "I want to make you feel ashamed of every harried person you permit to crease your brow, of every tear you shed, of every sensation of humiliation, fear, envy and self-pity that overcomes you -- in short, I want to make you ashamed to be unhappy."

In his enthusiasm for the gospel of happiness he forgets that there are sources of unhappiness other than those of personal handicaps. Human hostility and unemployment are harder to bear than deafness or even bereavement. But the fact remains that one who has had as many personal misfortunes as the author of "The God Fight" should have succeeded in adjusting himself to them as he did, manifests to an extraordinary degree the will to live. No reader can fail to admire the Goldman's pluck and to be influenced to re-evaluate his own life in the light of his autobiography.

The story of his life is briefly as follows: At the age of four he suffered from infantile paralysis and he lost the normal use of his legs. Yet by dint of will power he managed after years of hard practice to learn not only to walk without braces but even to dance. In his 19th year he became deaf. As a result he gave up his college education and went to work, but after a time he managed to resume his studies and to take up writing as a profession. He married very happily and his wife gave birth to a son. Before a year was over he lost his wife. The shock caused diabetes. But in a few months he came to himself again and by means of insulin injections and careful diet he ~~was~~ succeeded in regaining sufficient health to carry on further. He believes that the danger to his life was not due so much to the inherent character of the misfortunes as to his tendency to react to them with a sense of shame, envy and self pity. He compares his struggles with those emotions to mortal combat with dragons. "I have been hunted and slain a host of dragons," he says "which spat at me with toxic tongues of despair; I have faced, thwarted and vanquished a tribe of torturing demons."

Soterics would have to draw upon psychology to check on his interpretation of what he really combated. But whether or not he is correct in his interpretation, the fact that he succeeded where so many others with lesser misfortunes than his succumbed is of importance for the human problem arising out of the will to make the most of one's life. The question which we should want answered is: Of what significance is the phenomenon Raymond Leslie Goldman to the striving for life abundant? There is no question that it is of considerable significance. Goldman is fully aware of that fact, as is indicated by the statement quoted above concerning what he wants the reader to say to himself. But in dealing with that fact scientifically, we want to get at the general principle underlying it.

It seems to me that the success which Goldman had in overcoming his personal misfortune was, to a large extent, due to his having exerted his will to live not in the blind instructive fashion of the sub human but self consciously, i.e. with awareness of what he had to overcome and of the goal he wished to attain. Fuller awareness of all the elements involved in the struggle for existence accounts for man's greater power of survival. Thus the differentia of the element of self-consciousness which characterizes the human will to live, which was present in the case of Goldman, than in most people thus incapacitated, explains how he managed to succeed. This does not necessarily imply that the content of his awareness was warranted by the facts of his situation. But that the awareness itself acted as a factor for success is quite apparent.

A second soteric principle which we might derive from the Goldman case is that success in overcoming difficulties or handicaps in the struggle for existence reveals unsuspected life potentialities in the human being. The awareness of life potentialities converts the biological will to live into the human will to life abundant. We are reenforced in that awareness by every exhibition of courage in the face of odds and every such reenforcement becomes an added incentive to make the most of our own life. Hence the interest we display in my account of pluck and courage and the admiration which the display of those qualities call forth from us.

The reader will not learn from Goldman to find happiness which he would otherwise miss, but he will learn from Goldman to make more of his own life than he otherwise might. Actually Goldman himself realizes that he is not using happiness in the dictionary sense of the word. "According to the dictionary," he admits, "I am not a happy man at all; yet when I consider what a real zest for living fills me, how pleasantly stimulated I am by so many things in the world and how much more susceptible I am to laughter than to tears, I feel inclined to believe that the dictionary is wrong about it." What he is really trying to say is that he has achieved the life abundant or salvation. But the traditional associations of that term render its use by any at the present time out of question. To be able to experience a zest for life under circumstances such as described in "The Good Fight" comes very near having actually attained salvation. (A study should be made in this connection also of the life of Helen Keller.)

The foregoing principle that success in overcoming difficulties or handicaps in the struggle for existence reveals unsuspected life potentialities throws new light on the story of Job in the Bible. The author intuitively feels that Job, pious and prosperous holds out no special meaning or incentive for human life which is beset by all kinds of hardships and problems. So long as everything went well with Job there was nothing one could learn from him about the possibilities of human life. The author therefore puts into the mouth of Satan the argument that so long as Job did not what it meant to suffer, his exemplary life was meaningless. He accordingly advised God to subject Job to suffering. The fact that Job did not blaspheme but merely insisted that he did not deserve the suffering, was sufficient for the author of that book to prove that Job was a genuinely righteous man, and thus revealed the true depths or possibility of his piety. To that extent Job remained the exemplar of virtue that he had always been (Cf. Ezekiel's reference to Job.)

The significance of the human struggle for existence in the face of great odds is that such struggle reveals hidden life potentialities. That significance is often missed when the struggling will to live is that of a group instead of an

an individual. Yet basically the same principle applies to the group as well as to the individual. Goldman learning to walk despite the paralyzed muscles of his legs, and the Ghetto Jew making a living and finding happiness in life despite his civic disabilities are equally illustrative of how rich human life is in life potentialities. Thus even if the Jews have not or had not evolved any spiritual values during the centuries of dispersion and suffering, their success in having managed to survive should possess not only for Jews but also for the rest of the world the significance of having revealed unsuspected life potentialities, the awareness of which is necessary as an incentive to the striving for salvation.

* * *

Tuesday, October 14, 1941

The life and character of human beings is determined by the following three factors: 1) innate needs and native capacity; 2) environment, a) natural, b) artifactual and c) social; and 3) acquired needs. While the innate needs, native capacity and natural environment are on the whole unmodifiable in quantity and quality, the use to which they may be put is variable to an indefinite degree as a result of artifactual and social environment and acquired needs which are modifiable. There is a relationship of mutuality and interaction between environmental conditions and acquired needs. Hence any desired change in the one can be effected through the other. It is not always easy to determine which is cause and which is effect.

The educator functions within the domain of acquired needs. In view of their dependence upon environmental needs, he always comes up against the problem already sensed by Plato in his "Republic" of trying to educate the child in ideals which are either opposed or flouted by the environment. That is an inherent flaw in the function of the educator, which despite the mass of educational theorizing has not been overcome and never will. On the other hand, the spiritual leader who functions as theologian, educator and social engineer is in a position to control and modify both environmental conditions and acquired needs.

Soterics is a study of human life and character from the standpoint of acquired needs and their relationship to innate needs, innate capacity and the three categories of environmental conditions.

In subhuman creatures the will to live never rises to the level of consciousness and functions only through innate needs, native capacity and natural environment (which includes such inherited group formations as they belong to). These may be rendered somewhat modifiable through human manipulation, especially through modifying the natural environment and controlling the process of breeding. But the creatures themselves never plan or purpose any such modification.

In human beings with memory and imagination and abstraction enabling them to contemplate modification in the functioning of their own innate needs and native capacities as well as in their given natural and social environment, the will to live expresses itself through acquired needs. But many if not most of the acquired needs are of the wrong kind, in that they either interfere with the normal functioning of the innate needs etc. or artificially augment their functioning to such a degree as to lead to the disintegration of personality and of society. The problem of human character and conduct is how to harmonize the inborn with the acquired needs. This is essentially the problem of soterics.

* * * *

Wednesday, October 15, 1941

The goals of selfpreservation and the perpetuation of the species belong to the final values; the former develop the value of "selfhood" the other into that of "humanity." In traditional religion the use of self preservation has given rise to the belief in bodily resurrection and personal immortality. In a modern soteric system the urge to self preservation would involve in addition to living a healthy, dignified and creative life also self identification with a group which is expected to live on indefinitely and with humanity as a whole, whose eternity is a goal of the individual's life. Moreover ~~as~~ to the extent that the individual achieves both these goals, he identifies himself with the reality of godhood or the Power that makes for maximum life.

In the sub-human creatures both self preservation and perpetuation of the species are striven for unselfconsciously, i.e. on the level of functional needs. By very reason of that fact, they are very much more precarious, and even when secured they fail to give rise to the entire cluster of acquired needs that constitute self consciousness and civilization. Like all needs the cluster of acquired needs introduces a corresponding cluster of frustrations and conflicts, but that only means that self consciousness has introduced more life, for life is inherently "a series of needs, frustrations and the activities directed toward overcoming them."

A need is a physical or mental state of disequilibrium. It leads to activity called drive in order that the equilibrium be restored. The object which when attained restores the equilibrium is value. The drive expresses itself as greater sensitivity and modifiability of conduct and quicker learning. Both modifiability and learning refer to the substitution of one means for another in the attainment of objectives. Repetition of what is learned forms habit. Once the habit is established it becomes a need and furnishes drives on its own account.

~~Functional~~ Functional needs may be divided into viscerogenic and psychogenic (H.A. Murray and others "Explorations in Personality, 76). Viscerogenic needs are those which arise from the bodily tissues. Psychogenic are those which arise from the mental life and behavior.

* * * *

Thursday, October 16, 1941

The two outstanding facts about human drives (of which there are infinitely more than sub human) are 1) they continually meet with frustration, i.e. they are blocked by external factors, and 2) they are continually in mutual conflict, i.e. they are blocked by one another.

The purpose of all social and political ordering is to minimize the occasions of frustrations and conflict. The purpose of all educational disciplines like religion, ethics, etc., is to develop in individuals and groups not only the art of minimizing occasions of frustration and conflict but also the arts of tolerating frustration or otherwise reacting adequately to them (see "The Dynamics of Human

Behavior" P. Symonds, Ch. I) ("frustration tolerance") and resolving conflicts. All social and political ordering and educational disciplines operate with formal values. But educational disciplines go a step further. They introduce final values in dealing with frustration ~~tolerance~~ and conflicts.

The life story told in "The Good Fight" is an illustration of expertness in "frustration tolerance" While the author does not employ the conventional religious terminology to explain what conception of life or what final values stimulated him to ~~give~~ fight down shame, envy and self pity, he very definitely indicates that it was the conviction of life's inherent worthwhileness which impelled him to keep up the struggle against his handicaps. As he says, he does not care who the author of the book of life is, but he finds the contents of the book intrinsically fascinating. To conceive of life as a continuous story that not only makes sense but that outdoes any human classic, is to assume that it has an author who gives it its meaning. This is fundamentally to believe in God.

The operation of formal values in resolving conflicts can best be understood in the light of what we know concerning what happens when there is a conflict between needs or drives. Percival M. Symonds in "Dynamics of Behavior" Ch. II classifies the methods of meeting conflict in the following way: 1) one method is to fight one's way through so as to achieve both ends. In the majority of genuine conflicts this results in failure. It is like trying to be in two places at the same time. 2) A second method is to run away from the conflict (phantasy, withdrawal). 3) A third method, and one which is the most common is to repress one arm of the conflict and allow the other to have free expression. "Usually this method of handling conflict is satisfactory, if the outer frustrations are not too great. If however the outer frustrations become too intense, an individual may not be able to manage his repressed tendencies. They may press for some form of outward expression and the conflict itself then becomes intense and hard to manage." (I quote this in full because of the remarkable way in which it explains the conduct of the assimilated Jew who comes up against anti-Semitism.) 4) A fourth

method is some sort of compromise. This is the neurotic method. An attempt is made to satisfy both demands without satisfying either. It is meaningless behavior in that it is not appropriate to the situation. This is due to the fact that it is a conflict of a conscious with a sub-conscious drive. 5) Finally there is the integrated solution. In this case both drives in the conflict are fully in view in consciousness. "The individual must be in a position to weigh their relative values, to see to what extent through modification of them or through substitute gratification, values in each may be to a degree realized...The integrated solution cannot be achieved until the unconscious arm of the conflict is brought up to clear view in awareness so that it can be dealt with on the basis of reality."

In the light of the foregoing, it is apparent that the first four methods of meeting conflicts are, or result in, formal disvalues, and that only the fifth method is or results in formal values like justice, loyalty, decency, etc.

The formal values which are part of a culture or social heritage are the generalization of successful integrations of past conflicts. These generalizations are intended to serve in the resolution of subsequent conflicts.

There are numerous situations in life when the formal needs or drives are themselves in conflict. The attempt to resolve such conflict independently of the functional drives or needs that are involved is responsible for most of the ethical ~~casu~~ casuistry which usually ends up in sophistry.

The weakness of the Humanist interpretation of the "final needs or drives" is nowhere so clearly expressed as in the Humanist statement of those needs or drives contained in M. C. Ottos' "Things and Ideals" Ch. XII. I shall first quote what he has to say concerning the "Hunger for Cosmic Support" and then summarize the interpretation he gives to it.

"There is a rock fact of human nature," he says (p. 283) "against which the waves of rhetoric and logic dash in vain; a rock fact which after all the proofs and disproofs have fallen back into the sea of words from which they came, stands forth the clearer for the spray dashed over it. What is this stubborn fact? It is the fact that human beings refuse to be psychially alone in the universe; the fact that they demand that somehow there shall be a Power at the heart of things

which shall not let them suffer ultimate defeat, let appearances be what they may."

He comes to this conclusion after having shown that despite the repeated refutations of the conception of God by 1 the succession of discoveries and the widening of man's horizons, that conception is reborn in some new avatar time and time again. But instead of drawing the logical conclusion from that fact he is led off on a tangent by falling into the well worn groove of thinking to the effect that the hunger for cosmic support is purely a matter of feeling. He indulges in an eloquent passage on the indispensability of the emotions." The logically bes society" he goes on to say "may turn up its nose at the tang and pquancy of emotion; may attempt to act upon exclusively intellectual quarter out of its reach, where no weeds of fallacy nor wild flowers of fancy shall be permitted to grow, where syllogistic calm and order shall reign unchallenged. Life will overflow any such endeavor and be the richer for it. But to recognize the inevitability and worth of feeling is not to admit that everything that is longed for is there to be had And the fact that man naturally objects to being quite alone in the universe and thus craves fellowship with a great Guarantor of his interests and his personal continuance, is no proof that anything corresponding to the object of his longing exists. It may rather testify to the vestigial remains of an elemental hunger brought down frm the dim past, and transfigured by all manner of accretions through institutions and customs."

In the first place his accounting for the hunger for cosmic support as a feeling that enriches life is entirely gratuitous. He might as well dilate on 1 the enrichment of life through the hunger for nourishment. He fails to realize that life is hunger and that in the case of human life that hunger includes the hunger for cosmic support. Secondly to argue that this hunger for cosmic support is "the vestigial remains of an elemental hunger brought down from the dim past and transfigured by all manner of accretions etc." is to fly in face of the facts which fill the preceding part of the chapter, to the effect that despite the destruction still of all lthose accretions the elemental hunger turns out to be what it ~~shall~~ appear,

a hunger for cosmic support. To introduce at this point Gilbert Murray's conjecture that this yearning may in origin be 'the groping of a lonely-souled gregarious animal to find its herd or its herd leader in the great spaces between the stars,' is to display a hunger for authoritative support for a weak argument. As a matter of fact one might even grant that "in origin" man's hunger for cosmic support expresses itself as a "groping to find the herd or herd-leader," and yet maintain that with the ripening of intelligence man comes to realize that it is cosmic support as such that he really yearns for. The development of self-consciousness from consciousness is also represented by the development from "groping after the herd and herd leader" to "yearning after cosmic support." In all instances of development from consciousness to self-consciousness we take for granted that the revelations of the self-consciousness are a closer approximation to reality than those of mere consciousness. Why not take the same for granted in the case of the advance from the "groping" after the herd to the "yearning" for cosmic support, that the latter is more likely to approximate the truth?

But ~~when~~ the Humanist interpretation is at its weakest when it assumes that the recognition that the yearning for cosmic support is only the groping for the support of the herd would lead to improvement in human life and conduct. And strange to say he quotes a passage from Dewey which does not altogether jibe with the argument in hand. "God (sic!) only knows," says Dewey, how many of the sufferings of life are due to the belief that the natural scene and operation of our life are lacking in ideal import, and to the consequent tendency to flee to the lacking ideal factors to some other world inhabited exclusively by ideals." Dewey is talking here of the Platonic dichotomy between real and ideal. What has that to do with the yearning for cosmic support?

To accept the "stern condition of being psychically alone in all the reach of space and time" is according to Otto "the challenge of these supreme times." "The hope of a new world is alive today," he goes on to say, "in millions of hearts the world around. May we not take courage from past achievement?" But we may well ask: "Does not that past achievement owe something at least to man's past

achievement owe something at least to man's past habit of trying to satisfy his hunger for cosmic support, a hunger which Otto himself has shown to be irrepressible.

I've just received a letter from a lawyer, George Frankenthaler, telling me that the late Sam C. Lamport named me in his will as the first alternate trustee to the five regular trustees of a charitable fund which he established. Apparently he held me in greater respect than I did him. Strange that in all the years I had known him I hardly ever took the trouble to upbraid him for his vulgarity, except the very last time I met him. That was at my niece Carol Rubin's wedding. He made some irreverent remark about God which I resented and I said to him he should stop blaspheming. In case I had given in to my distaste for his general behavior and I had refused to permit his funeral to take place at the SAJ I should have had quite some difficulty in overcoming the embarrassment which would have ensued upon my learning that he had thought well enough of me to make me the first alternate trustee.

With the same mail that brought me the above mentioned letter came another reminder of ~~how~~ how with the best of will it is well nigh impossible to live up to one's ideals. I refer to the copy of the Congress Weekly (Oct. 3/41), containing the Theodore Lewis review of Cyrus Adler's "I Have Considered the Days." It is a frank and honest description of that book, which should never have been published. Besides being inherently infantile in form and content, it reveals the inner rottenness of American Jewish life. That a man of such limited understanding and imagination should have been entrusted with ranking leadership is a stigma on the collective life of American Jewry. If The "Reconstructionist" magazine should have been the first to debunk that man, in the interests of an effective Jewish leadership for which it is supposed to be contending. Yet when Theodore Lewis who is a member of the Editorial Board asked whether we would publish his review of the book I said no. If I had allowed that review to appear in the Reconstructionist I would have been called an ingrate and a traitor and what not, and would probably have had to resign from the Seminary.

Although I owe it to Adler that I have been allowed to teach in the Seminary, he is also responsible for the ill will which most of my colleagues and members of the Seminary Board bear toward me. It is he who has gotten them to think of me as a radical and a secular nationalist. The fact is that when I credit Adler with having made it possible for me to remain at the Seminary, I am aware that it was not some profound recognition on his part of the value of what I had to give to the students that prompted him to let me alone, but rather that he was so ununderstanding and uninterested in the basic problems of Jewish life and religion that he didn't realize what I was trying to accomplish. Fundamentally what decided him to let me alone was the cliché about academic freedom which he honored too much to start proceedings against me. Now that he is gone Ginzy would like to see me out.

* * * *

Friday, October 17, 1941

The religious attitude toward life places as much emphasis upon the belief in the human soul as it does upon the belief in God. Therefore, in challenging the religious attitude men challenge the belief in the human soul by the same token that they challenge the belief in God. It is not surprising that/should be the case, since, as the analysis of the belief in the human soul will show, the affirmation that man possesses a soul is the correlative of the belief that the cosmos is divine or possesses godhood. (Examples of challenge to belief in the human soul are given by M.C. Otto in "Things and Ideals")

To meet the challenge to the belief in the human soul it is necessary in the first place to note the various formulations of that belief since it was first held. To begin with that belief was based upon the inference from dreams that every one had a ghost-like double, shade or phantom. It was also pictured as life energy rending in the blood, in the breath. It was also identified with the name. Philosophus represented the soul as spirit which is the antithesis of body. Plotenus contributed largely to the dualism which marked the religious thinking of western mankind for centuries. Descartes stated that the soul dwelt in the pineal gland. Since animals did not possess a soul they were mere mechanisms. Modern

psychology began by deneging the existence of the soul and has ended up in denying the reality of consciousness. The saying goes that it first lost its soul, then its mind and finally its consciousness. Laplace claimed that he searched the heavens with his telescope and did not find God. He claimed there was no need for the hypothesis of God's existence to understand the universe. The psycholgist studies the behavior of the human body and not finding any evidence of mind, soul or consciousness likewise denies their existence.

What is wrong with the conclusions of the psychologist is analogous to what is wrong with Laplace's statement about God. Both fail to realize that when a belief both ~~perx~~ persists and undergoes metamorphoses there must be some vital human experience which men attempt to register by means of that belief; some reality which they attempt to represent as best they can in accordance with their intellectual equipment. When that equipment is so enlarged as to render the representations of a preceding age obsolete it is necessary to find a more fitting representation for that persistent belief but not to treat it as meaningless. Spencer in his First Principles has pointed out that there must be a grain of truth in the most fantastic belief.

In the perennial belief in the human soul it seems to me men have sought to register the experience that there is more to the human being than meets the eye and to express the hope that every human being will learn so to live as to bring that more to the surface. This experience and hope are implied in every one of the ancient conceptions of the soul from the most primitive to the most philosophic, from the belief in the ghost-double to the belief in some static immortal essence.

We thus have in man's belief in the human soul the intuitive awareness that there is so much that is latent and potential in the human being, that no statement about him, no description of his powers or achievements, no definition of his being can fully exhaust all that there is to him and in him. Thanks to this inexhaustible fund of potentiality which man possesses he is not a fixed quantity or quality, he

is incalculable and unpredictable but above all he is creative. One of the answers to the question: Have you a soul? quoted by Otto coincides most strikingly with this conception of soul. That answer reads as follows: "Yes, indeed, I have a soul. It is not however a thing kind of soul I was taught to believe in. I really haven't any idea what it is. I know that it is something big and overpowering and that at other times it seems almost to leave me. I feel it most when I rise above life's sordidness and meanness and follow my better impulses. How to define it I don't know, but it is the best part of me." The soul is human nature plus, in the same way as God is all nature plus, for God represents the inexhaustible fund of potentiality that exists in nature, that aspect of latency by virtue of which it is creative and not merely mechanical. Any organism in which the whole is more than the sum of its parts illustrates the meaning of the plus. This parallelism between God and the soul is recognized in traditional religion, as is evident from the conception of man as created in the image of God, and from the Psalmist's outcry "Thou hast made him little less than divine." As some will put it "Thou!" Drop God out of one end of the sentence and man falls out of the other." Belief in the soul is an affirmation of the infinite worth of man as the belief in God is affirmation of the infinite worth of the cosmos. The Jewish mystic who speaks of the soul as "a portion of the God above" and the poet who pictures man as "a bit of God himself" sense the truth of the mutuality between the two ~~conceptions~~ concepts. Perhaps the relation of the apex of the pyramid to the rest of the pyramid might be used to symbolize that mutuality. Neither the human plus (soul) nor the cosmic plus (God) can be exhaustively described in any affirmative definitions. Definition in their case must consist mostly in negating inadequate description.

It follows from the foregoing that we must never reckon with anything human whether in our own life or in the lives of others in terms only of the visible, the immediate and the actual only, but we must also take into account the invisible, the imponderable, the potential.

The failure to live up to this principle leads to the effacement of the distinction between man and beast. Failure to live up to this principle in the life of others leads to treating them as though they were beasts of burden or as though

they were inanimate tools. "Hands wanted" not human beings. Labor becomes a mere commodity. All ability is measured in dollars and cents. A recent advertisement reads: John D. Rockefeller Sr. once said "The ability to deal with people is as purchasable as sugar or coffee...and I will pay more for that ability than for any other under the sun." All streamlined efficiency aiming at minimum overhead, large scale production, uniformity of output is in danger of becoming soulless. Quote case mentioned by Otto (ibid p. 242) and the case of dishwashing referred to above. Also the meaning of the 100 daily benedictions.

On the other hand living up to the recognition of the human plus is itself no guarantee tht it will lead to bringing that plus to the surface. For it is possible to reckon with the element of soul in oneself and in others to the detriment of the soul. It depends into what a man puts his soul. If he puts his soul into the purpose of achieving power over others he not only destroys the souls of his victims by enslaving them, but destroys also his own soul. To what extent whole nations can be denuded of soul is illustrated by the functioning of the communist regime as described in "Darkness at Noon" and by the functioning of the nazi regime as exemplified in the diary of Gottfried Leske "I ~~was~~ Was a Nazi Flier."

The only way in which the recognition of the human plus can lead to universal salvation is so to live and act as to elicit the element of soul in all whose lives touch our own, and to strengthen in ourselves and in others the faith in man's measureless worth and inexhaustible potentialities for good.

* * * *

Saturday night, October 18, 1941

I came upon the theme of the soul in the course of my thinking about soterics. It occurred to me that it would be an appropriate subject for this morning's sermon, since we were to read the story of the creation. But my problem was how to popularize whatever ideas I had on the subject. It would not do to discuss it in such technical terms as implied in the concept "final values." Yesterday morning I had little more than the students' answers given by Otto. I was really wondering

is incalculable and unpredictable but above all he is creative. One of the answers

catalytic idea that would help me crystalize my thoughts on the~~y~~ subject. As I sat in the automobile during the two and a half hour trip to the farm I seemed to make no headway. But somehow I did not get panicky. On the way back about four o'clock as I was sitting back all relaxed the idea that the belief in the soul registers the intuition that there is more to man than what meets the eye came like a flash. From that moment every other thought I had had about the soul fell into its place. Last night I wrote up the preceding two pages and this morning I preached the sermon. The fact that the attendance was rather small didn't annoy me as much as the general haphazard fashion in which things are run at the SAJ. Despite that I managed to get my sermon across and those who were present seemed to enjoy it very much. This afternoon at the Oneg Shabbat in honor of the Hattan Torah and Hattan Bereshit Ira pronounced it one of the best ever given at the SAJ services.

In the talk this afternoon I carried out the idea of the soul in things and applied to to the need of our realizing that there was a soul to the Torah.

* * * *

Monday, October 20, 1941

When I met my new class in lthe T.I. a few weeks ago for the first time I gave them a written test to find out what their attitude was toward Judaism. I asked them to answer the following questions: 1) State on what grounds you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, ~~nationalist~~ or anything else in Judaism. 2) To what extent do you observe the Sabbath, Kashrut, ~~and~~ recital of prayers? 3) Do you regard the stories of creation of the world and of man, of the Patriarchs, of the ten plagues in Egypt, of the revelation on Mt. Sinai, of the standing still of the sun for Joshua as fact or fiction? If you consider those stories important to Jewish life state your reason why. 4) What do you expect from the course in religion?

After reading the answers I found that the students might be divided into three groups: 1) 11 Orthodox; 2) 8 Conservatives; 3) 6 rationalists; the only thing they have in common is their nationalism and the observance of Sabbath and kashrut.

The orthodox take the position that the supernatural origin of Judaism is the only guarantee of its truth. From that standpoint nothing in the Bible is incredible or subject to the canons of reason. The conservatives are befuddled. The rationalists insist that Judaism must be compatible with modern science. The average of the students is 19-20. Their academic status is two years out of high school or Soph-Junior. On the whole the test shows that young people who get an intensive Jewish education are left intellectually and spiritually maladjusted, and unable to cope with the problem of living in two civilizations. So long as no provision is made to overcome this maladjustment there can be no future to Judaism, and the Jews are bound to be the victims of hatred from without and conflict from within.

As yet there is nothing on the horizon to make me feel in the least sanguine. Alex Dushkin who is working with the Jewish Education Committee headed by Judge Roseman has turned out to have less backbone than I thought he had and more of an opportunist than I thought he was. Instead of using his position to experiment with a more promising and creative type of Jewish education, he fools around with the existing systems, and tries to cover up their inner rottenness by giving them an outward sheen.

Neither was I much encouraged by the Seminary celebration last night. Years ago I recorded in the journal my complaint against Cyrus Adler that he does nothing to bring the Seminary closer to the people. Finkelstein is now doing that with a vengeance, because the Seminary has now become almost entirely dependent on popular support. But the way he does it is disgusting. He plays up to the tendency of the Jews to curry the favor of the gentiles. To that end he organized the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in which Judaism did not have a voice last year, and this year just got something of a squeak. At the celebration last night which was called "Inaugural Assembly," the main address was given by Dr. John A. Mackey the dean of the Princeton Theological Seminary. It was a good sermon with a good Christian climax. All the other Christian theological seminaries were represented. It was in fact a resplendent Christian representation. Judaism was represented by our own Ginzy. The talk he made was "ginzy." It was unprepared,

casual and pointless. For the first ten minutes he marshalled two old stories which always call forth a ha-ha from his "hasidim" and some hackneyed wisecracks of his about rabbis who are real rabbis and rabbis who are preachers and orators, and all such nonsense. This was followed by a catalogue of the different places where Jews had academies beginning with Babylon and ending with Vilna to prove that they had amounted to nothing so long as they had no academies. But strange as it may seem time and again in the course of his half hour of persiflage he interlarded it with snide remarks about Reconstructionism, even going so far as to say that what we need ~~is~~ to reconstruct the Jew, but we do not need to reconstruct Judaism. Another pointed remark of his was that we cannot sum up Judaism in a slogan. To drive that remark home, he even thought it fit to criticize Hillel for trying to answer the would-be proselyte while the latter was standing on one foot. On the whole that performance of Ginzy's was in bad taste, and the entire affair -- which incidentally was poorly attended from the standpoint of the audience -- did not raise my hopes concerning the future of Judaism.

Before writing down the preceding item, I was debating with myself whether I should resume the study of Talmud, something I have been wanting to do for the longest time, or use the hours which I happen to have free to note down the contents of the item. I asked myself what would I get from the study of a passage in the Talmud. Certainly nothing to exalt or edify me; nor would it be in any degree informative. All it might do would be to revive in me the remembrance of some forgotten text. The recollection of it would afford me momentary satisfaction, and that is all.

I came a little while ago from the Seminary, where this evening Saul Lieberman the newly appointed professor of Palestinian Literature read a chapter of his forthcoming book on Palestinian piety of the second to fourth centuries C.E. It was a brilliant lecture and displayed wise reading in ancient and modern languages, keen power of analysis and synthesis. The lecture dealt with instances of magic, astrology and incantations which the Rabbis managed to reinterpret and cast into the mold of Jewish teaching. It not only gave a highly interesting picture of

inner Jewish life during those early centuries but it demonstrated to what extent the method of the rabbis was to accept prevailing ideas and practices and give them a Jewish significance instead of trying to suppress them. When one knows Talmud that way, one should spend time on it. But just to read it with the aid of the traditional commentaries is like trying to read the Bible that way. It is a most unrewarding task.

* * * *

Tuesday, October 21, 1941

Last Sunday as I was teaching the class in Religion 5-6 I was struggling to express in Hebrew the distinction between interpretation and reinterpretation, using for the first the term (p. 186) and for the second or when it dawned on me that that distinction had long been recognized. When the ancients had in mind interpretation they spoke of and when they had in mind reinterpretation they spoke of . As the discussion is conducted in Hebrew, it was possible for it to be much less labored than it would otherwise have been from that point on.

I've just come from listening to three lectures, one by H.L. Ginsberg, the other by Robert Gordis and the third by Sperber. Ginsberg's lecture was exactly the one I usually give to my first year class in Religion at the Teachers Institute. It was as elementary as all that. Gordis' was very illuminating, and Sperber taught me something I didn't know. The point he made was that the Keri and ^{Qeri}Kabib represent two ancient reconstructions of the Bible text, which differed occasionally in style and vocabulary.

* * * *

Wednesday, October 22, 1941

When I think of the radical views expressed by every one of the four speakers -- the four new professors at the Seminary -- I am flabbergasted. That people holding such views were not ashamed to sign the letter of protest against the New Haggadah is too ridiculous for words. Lieberman stated that the rabbis did not suppress the heathen magic and incantations which the people were in the habit of resorting to, but that they reinterpreted them in the light of Jewish teaching. H. L. Ginsberg said that we cannot be certain whether ^{3/}Moses was a monotheist or not, and that the Israelites were influenced for the good in their general and religious life by the Canannite's; Gordis' thesis, ^{as} that the entire wisdom literature belongs to the proto Saducean trend in Judaism and that all of its ideas, social, political and economic are determined by the class attitude of the writers who belonged to the wealthy ruling element in Jewry cannot but have a devastating effect on the traditional spirit of reverence with which that literature has historically been regarded in Judaism. Even Sperber's paper cut the ground from under the sacredness of the masoretic text, which Jewish tradition has jealously defended. I dare say that I have something of a share in the freedom with which those gentlemen permit themselves to air such highly heterodox views, in that I have openly challenged the traditional assumptions instead of doing so sub-rosa. Yet these same men gang themselves up against me to please Finkelstein and Ginsberg.

I have just come back from the Seminary where I scored one of those rare triumphs which enable me to withstand the hostility of my colleagues. I was scheduled to act as chairman of the evening to introduce Hillel Bavli who was to read a paper on "The Universal Aspects of Hebrew Poetry." Smarting under Louis Ginzbergs attack of Reconstructionism last Sunday I made up my mind to get even with him in my introductory remarks this evening. For a moment I hesitated whether I should venture on what might be criticized as controversial territory. I was even afraid that Finkelstein might try to stop me and create a scandal. And when I saw Ginzberg and his wife in the audience I almost got cold feet. But I would

have been very unhappy had I yielded to these fears. And now that I came out of the ordeal with flying colors I am indeed happy. Even Arzt, now Finkelstein's henchman, remarked "It is a good thing to carry on the controversy on so high a level."

This is ^{what} I said: One of the things in Rabbinic Judaism I am profoundly grateful for is that R. Judah the Prince found it necessary when compiling the Mishnah to record not only the majority of opinion but also the minority opinion. At one of the sessions this week the majority opinion was expressed in criticism of Reconstruction in Jewish life, to the effect that we should reconstruct the Jew not Judaism. From the same authoritative source came the suggestions 1) that Judaism cannot be compressed within any slogan and 2) we should not ~~xxx~~ resort to make generalizations. In registering the minority opinion in favor of Reconstructionism my purpose is not to enter into any controversy, but to introduce a point which will lead up to the theme of tonight "The Universal Aspect of Hebrew Poetry."

In declaring that no slogan can do justice to Judaism the speaker found fault with Hillel who tried to convey the essence of Judaism in a brief principle even though Hillel had guarded himself against criticism by adding "The rest is commentary; go and learn. Moreover I'd rather be wrong with Hillel than right with Shamai. Besides the statement: we should reconstruct the Jew but not Judaism is itself a slogan and a very expressive one. Though when we analyze we find it quite untenable. For what makes a Jew if not Judaism. When therefore you reconstruct him you cannot help reconstructing Judaism. But we need not press that point. Reconstruction in Jewish life means not so much reconstructing Judaism as reconstructing our idea of Judaism.

That purpose I believe is well served by the conception of Judaism as an evolving religious civilization. That it is religious, there can be no two opinions among us. That it is evolving, even to a breathtaking degree, was amply demonstrated in the four brilliant lectures which were delivered from this platform the last two nights. But we deem it important also to emphasize that it is a civilization, consisting of a cluster of elements such as land, language, poetry. How

important it is to stress that conception of Judaism because clear to me again the other day when I learned that in one of the congregation schools on the West Side (82 St. Cong.) where weekday teaching of Hebrew was recently introduced, the rabbi (Schactel) told the teachers that when they would have occasion to explain the school to the parents of the children, they should be careful not to speak of it as a Hebrew school but as a religious school.

No civilization can exist without poetry and no poetry without a civilization etc. Hence, Bavli His paper was excellent.

* * * *

Thursday, October 23, 1941

Soterics or How to Interpret Human Life. As with all interpretation, Soterics is bound to be largely reinterpretation.

The very effort to live and to make the most of life implies that life has meaning or is worthwhile. If we want to live intelligently and expect our efforts to lead to the improvement of life, we must strive to get at its meaning and understand what makes it worthwhile.

What is generally designated as being self-centered or self-obsessed really means merely satisfying one's functional needs but not one's formal and final needs.

* * * *

Friday, October 24, 1941

I've just read through an article in a recent summer issue of Harper's (p. 430-440) by Benjamin Akzin on "The Jewish Question after the War." He makes the point that the hope of having the 5,000,000 ~~500,000~~ Jews rehabilitated in Europe even in case of a Hitler defeat is without basis. While for all other minorities the solution of having them migrate to their ethnic kinsmen in the nearby countries is a feasible one, it does not apply to the Jews. Their plight is indescribable.

came to

This article was sent me by Charles A Cowen who ~~XXXXXX~~ see me the other day. He called my attention to the fact that in our Reconstructionist thinking we overlook the tremendous problem of the five million ~~xx~~ Jews in Europe who have nothing but extermination to look forward to.

In returning the article to him I am writing him as follows: Macabre as is the picture Akzin draws of the Jewish future, it will not awaken in the American Jew that pity for European brother Jew you spoke of, unless the American Jew be somehow made to feel a sense of kinship with the latter. We therefore cannot afford to let up on efforts to reenforce that sense by rendering Jewish life creative of values besides those of pity.

One of the problems which runs like a threat¹ through the various philosophies both ancient and modern is the question: which is prior, will or knowledge? It seems to me that the problem is an artificial one and that it is the result of the usual process of reifying the various aspects into which for purposes of thinking we abstract from a real situation. In reality every manifestation of life expresses itself as volition, emotion and knowledge. The manifestation of life is to be identified as much with the one as with the other. These are the three attributes of the substance the will to live. If I am not mistaken Spinoza treated will and knowledge as identical.

Spinoza is probably the first modern who not only made the salvation of man ~~man's~~ the main concern of systematic thinking but also the first and so far the only one to realize that the problem of salvation must be approached integrally, i.e. from the standpoint of nature, reason and God. Nature corresponds to the functional needs, reason to the formal needs and God to the final needs.

Although the ancients reckoned with the three aspects of reality, namely nature, reason and God, they did so in a way that gave one primacy and implied that the others were ^{derivative} ~~derivative~~ or secondary. Thus the ancients definitely saw everything in terms of God. Reason and nature were his creatures in creation. The philosophers, especially the Stoics, gave primacy to reason and assimilated both nature and God to it. The moderns, especially the Romanticists make nature primary and treat both reason and God as derivative. Spinoza probably stands alone in giving to the three aspects coordinate value. It may be that it is this fact about him which is intuitively sensed and which has given him so high a reputation.

"Self" and "humanity" as final values are and may never be existential but essential values, i.e. they represent potentiality which is ever greater than actuality. It is different in the case of the value "God" and the need for Him. The self and humanity may be forever in the making, but God to be God must be actuality and not merely essence, because both "self" and "humanity" start with a given out of which they emerge. Not so with God. He is his own cause, self-created, hence always an actuality as God. This does not preclude His evolution and continual self-creation. But at no time in His existence was he other than God. This is certainly not the case with self and humanity. In most people self never arrives, and as far as humanity is concerned, it is barely on the way.

* * * *

Monday, October 27, 1941 7:30 A.M.

I feel this morning like a school boy resuming his school attendance after a long vacation, all ready and eager to go back to school, with his books in his brief case, face shining, shoes polished and clothes all trim. Although the T.I. classes have long been in session and I have found my work with them this year delightful mainly because of the ~~ease~~ ease with which I have at ~~last~~ last learned to lecture in Hebrew, this is my first day at the Seminary. I am extremely eager to begin my course in Soterics, to see how it will work out.

Like a flash of light the thought came to me while I had a few moments with Ira last Saturday afternoon that the second chapter in Soterics which is to deal with the will to maximum life should make the point that the essence of the will to maximum life as distinguished from the will to life is that the former is an urge for the potential. The awareness of the potential is perhaps of all suggested human differential the most characteristic.

3:00 P.M.

At the end of the first lecture this morning at the Seminary which dealt with Soterics, I was applauded to the echo. I was wondering what called forth that applause, when Ribner explained to me that the students wanted to express their acclaim of the stand I was taking vis a vis the members of the Faculty who are forever criticizing me and the Reconstructionist movement. Later I learned that Louis

Ginzberg again took a fling at me after last Wednesday night, making the point that like Philo and unlike Maimonides I come as a non-Jew to Judaism.

In addition, the older students are all worked up on account of my departure from the method I had employed with the men who gave their sermons in class preparatory to giving them in the Seminary synagogue. After Finkelstein's assertion that the main cause for the Faculty's protest against me was the type of sermons the students were preaching, I made up my mind to have the students preach along Levinthalian lines -- plying some generally admitted truth around a number of rabbinic quotations. Consequently the first two sermons this year, one by Barish and the other by Bernards which were given in class today dealt with Palestine and with the importance of hospitality in the conventional manner in which one hears sermons preached in conservative congregations. Davis, Vorspan, Jack Cohen and a few others have been pestering me ever since they got wind of this new method and are raising quite a howl. They feel that they are being muzzled and deprived of an opportunity to do any genuine individual thinking about contemporary Jewish and spiritual problems.

For the first time in all the years that I have been teaching at the Seminary I permitted myself today to open the academic year with prayer. I asked the students to recite with me the prayer (p.191)

* * *

Wednesday, October 29, 1941

We Jews are sacrificing important contemporary values for the sake of maintaining a sense of continuity with the past. As I was trying to put down a number of names of men whose biographies I should like to see figure in the Friday night readings the Reconstructionist group is working on, I was struck by the paucity of outstanding characters which the past contributed in comparison with the large number of great Jewish contemporaries. Whether this is the case because there really were but few outstanding men in the last twenty centuries of our history, or because the habit of noting and recording the values of personality was not in vogue is a moot question. For example, the few I can think of just now are Hillel, Akiba, Rashi, Maimonides.

Their lives have universal significance and are a source of inspiration to a Jewish future. On the other hand the last two or three generations are replete with names of great Jewish characters whose lives deserve to be better shown and to become Jewish sancta.

What made me think of all this was the article by Hans Kohn on A. D. Gordon in the Menorah Journal '32 which I read yesterday, probably for the first time. I had known the usual facts about Gordon but what I read in that article was a revelation to me. The central thought of his philosophy that this would be a better world if the individual worker were interested not merely in improving his personal lot, but in transforming himself into an agent for the improvement of human life as a whole is a new and refreshing approach to the apparently insoluble problems of social conflict. This I had not known. A. D. Gordon, however, did not merely theorize. He lived his philosophy. His was not the sterile sanctity of the sanctified egoists who figure in history. His example is an inspiration to high thinking and simple living. I know of no one in the entire roster of our ancient great men -- outside the prophets -- that can compare with him.

The idea that the will to life abundant is basically the will to actualize the maximum possible number of potentialities is most fecund. The fact that man is acutely aware of his limitations and that he refuses to accept them is part of that same will to salvation. Hence the tendency at first to identify salvation with personal immortality. As man learns to manipulate the physical processes of nature, the division of labor, the arts of exchange new vistas of life open up before him. To occupy and exploit ~~these~~ them seems to mean to him salvation and his interest is transferred from personal immortality to the improvement of this world.

I find support for the assumption that the will to maximum life is the will to the actualization of the maximum of potentialities in oneself, and in others to the extent that one's life touches theirs, in what I regard a most remarkable statement of the case for morality in M. Greyson's "A ~~Sketch~~ Sketch of Morality Independent of Obligation or Sanction." I am not particularly concerned with his trying to disprove the need for obligation or sanction. On the contrary, not having reckoned with

Aristotles' principle of fourfold cause, he fails to reckon with obligation or sanction as constituting the formal cause of moral behavior. But he did apprehend the nature of the human will to live in need of expressing itself in moral conduct because it is inherently driven to actualize those potentialities of behavior which we approve and ~~an~~ designate as moral. Even though he does not quite grasp the full significance of the sense of potentiality as that which creates ever new needs in the human will to live, he comes very near realizing that significance. The translator describes his thesis as follows: "Morality is thus conceived as a natural internal energy for good, translating itself into action by its own exuberance for good." And he himself says: "The superior being is he who undertakes and risks the most, either by his thought or by his actions. This superiority springs from a greater store of inward force; he has more power. For this very reason, he has a higher duty. Even the sacrifice of life may still be, in certain cases, an expansion of life, which has become sufficiently intense to prefer an impulse of sublime exaltation to years of mere groveling existence."

Goyan likewise fails to reckon with the element of final cause and he reduces morality to a purely human affair. To this of course we cannot subscribe. This does not mean, however, that we have to return to the traditional formulations of the final values -- self, humanity and God. Each of these transcendental values represents a group of potentialities. God is thus the source of infinite potentialities, or more literally stated, is the symbol we employ to express the fact that nature is not a mechanism of finite possibilities but a living thing ever creative because it possesses infinite potentialities. The ancient and medieval philosophers lost themselves in a maze of contradictions because they insisted upon identifying God with actualized potentiality. The truth is the very opposite. It is not actuality but potentiality that constitutes godhood.

After the chapter dealing with the will to life abundant as the substratum of the three types of needs, drives and values, the rest of the book will discuss I Nature or the functional type of need a) its basic character, b) its inadequacy. II Reason, or the formal type of interest-- its dialectich character. III God or the final type of interests a) its indispensability; b) its inadequacy.

A committee of three students -- Bennet, Kieval and Vorspan -- appointed to see me about the course in homiletics conferred with me tonight. As a result of the discussion we decided that I should leave it to the student-preacher to express his preference either for the midrash type of sermon or for the analytic type. In case a student took the midrash type of sermon I would spend the hour following on the one in which he gave the sermon demonstrating what might be done with that topic if it were treated from the analytic point of view. Those who will undertake to preach an analytic type of sermon are willing to face the consequences in case they have a run in with Finkelstein or any other member of the Faculty.

The committee also asked me to give them a fifth period on Mondays to be devoted to the discussion of contemporary Jewish problems. Their appetite has been whetted by the course I gave last year in Judaism as a Civilization. They want more of the same kind. I assented provided they get permission from Finkelstein to change to 50 minute period to 45 minutes and to have me give them a fifth period.

Kieval who has to give a sermon on "Prayer" next Monday and when I had shown how to treat it midrashically, asked me to help him change it into the other type of sermon. It certainly turned out to be a more stimulating and interesting approach after I half hour's discussion.

* * * *

Saturday, November 1, 1941

In the human being the will to live expresses itself in the same way as it does in the sub-human being. The hereditary biological interests are just as urgent in man as they are in the beast. But this area of realization is in the immediate, the visible and the tangible. These values conflict with those which satisfy the acquired needs. The acquired needs growing out of the powers of memory imagination and powers of abstraction. synthesis and communication have as their corresponding values not the immediate and the actual but the remote and the potential. This inevitably leads to conflict which in traditional religion was designated as the conflict between the good and evil inclination. Such designation is not helpful, because in setting up the satisfaction of the biological needs

as the objective of an inherently evil drive, it fails to make clear that to satisfy them is wrong not because they are intrinsically bad, but because alongside potential values which result from the acquired needs, they are less of the amount of life within than is ~~neither~~ man's reach. Moreover such designation, in identifying the potential needs as the urge of a distinct inclination, leads us to believe that those needs have an independent existence apart from the biological, and are best kept alive by being kept as far apart as possible from those biological needs.

The modern psychological approach is bound to be far more helpful. In the first place it discloses that the very description of the conflict between the immediate and the acquired needs as a conflict between the evil and the good inclination is a device which the mind has throughout the ages employed to reinforce the acquired needs, which are intrinsically weaker than the immediate. Apparently that device has not helped the human being very much, because it functions only when it is further accompanied by social sanctions. The individual left to his own resources is all too likely to give way to his biological needs. So long as it is not possible to depend upon the individual's own realization of the difference between the limited life yielded by the immediate values and the abundant life yielded by the potential values, human existence will always be in a mess. Hence there is more hope in the psychological approach which teaches us to regard the inner conflict not as a struggle for victory between two intransigent foes, but as the normal, natural or divine process of growth from the less abundant to the more abundant life. To try to achieve the more abundant life by treating the interest that would yield the less abundant life as emanating from the evil inclination is part of the same thought pattern as the one in which the mentally diseased were treated as possessed by evil spirits. The psychological approach enables us by means of its analyses and discoveries so to understand the process of growth with its inner dialectic of inborn and acquired needs that we can in time learn to facilitate it instead of allowing it to remain as sporadic and haphazard as it generally is. All the recent discoveries in the dynamics of human behavior, with the light they throw on the significance of inner conflict, frustration, repression, regression, fixation,

displacement, identification, projection and sublimation indicate how human nature gropingly seeks to achieve the abundant life not by repudiating the biologic needs but by various devices achieved spontaneously. These devices themselves are in need of being perfected so that they might function with least friction and expenditure of psychic energy. One of the most important results of this psychologic approach would be a system of education that would not be a mere ~~xxx~~ transmission of a heritage or training in power technique but the fitting of the human being to achieve the kind of synthesis between inherited and acquired needs between actual and potential values that would permit his growth to be perennial.

The tendencies ~~and simplification~~ to reification and simplification are responsible both for the overemphasis and underemphasis of each of the three aspects of the will to life abundant. Overemphasis consists in ascribing dominance and underemphasis in ascribing subservience. Thus the ancients who saw all of life in terms of its relation to God, society and personality treated all human law as emanating solely from God, the will of society and the good will of the lawgiver. Those who were consistent in this view of life went so far as to maintain that a thing is right because God wills it; it is not the rightness of a thing that leads God to will it. Thus reason and goodness were treated as subservient to the will of God. Rationalists both ancient and modern asserted that the formal principles of mathematics and of logic were the governing principles of reality. God willed only that which was right. God himself was subject to the laws of mathematics logic and ethics. In human nature likewise our conduct was dominated by what we regarded as for our best interests, e.e. by whatever degree of rationality we have attained. Romanticists and naturalists regard the blind impulses ~~and~~ and desires as the dominant factor in human life. To them reason and meaning arise out of the conflict of those impulses and desires and are merely the names given to the modus vivendi which is precipitated out of the conflict. When the seed of a tree is planted in the earth and it begins to grow it grows simultaneously as root and stem and fruit. It would be absurd to treat one element as dominant and the others as subservient to it. It is equally absurd to treat any one element of the will to live the life abundant as dominant with the others subservient to it.

To understand the difference between the will to live and the will to salvation it is necessary to analyze carefully the relation of soterical value to survival value. It is apparent that those developments of human life which augment its variety, richness, beauty and spiritual character do not necessarily have survival value. On the contrary they seem to expose the society in which they take place to dangers that would otherwise not exist. A simple illustration is that of a pacifist society. A society in which the ideal of peace is taken seriously, has little chance of surviving an attack by a horde of barbarians. Within any society itself the individual who takes exception to conventional hypocrisies because he feels impelled by a sense of the higher potentialities which might be attained, were honesty and justice to obtain, is likely to meet the fate of a Jeremiah or a Socrates. Evidently in the case of a pacifist society in the midst of a barbaric world or of a highly ethical person in an immoral society that which has soterical value does not have survival value.

Nevertheless it would be a mistake if this particular fact were generalized into the principle that there is no intrinsic connection between survival value and soterical value. The assumption underlying the ascription of soterical value to any type of behavior is that it is such primarily because it has survival value. That it contributes desirable quality to life goes without saying, but that if generally accepted and properly put into effect by developing at the same time the necessary safeguards must be assumed as part of the very character of any conduct as soterical. The first attempts at flying were undoubtedly extremely dangerous. Those who ventured on those attempts performed deeds of very little survival value, as far as they personally were concerned. But they certainly performed deeds of great soterical value in opening up new potentialities of human experience. Nevertheless their deeds would not have soterical value if they were not animated by the conviction that ultimately flying would become so practicable that it would contribute to man's chances of survival, first against human enemies, and ultimately against unforeseen dangers of nature. It is because this assumed ultimate coincidence of soterical values and survival value that we emphasize in the concept of God as the power not ourselves that makes for salvation.

Wednesday, November 5, 1941

The three categories of interests (phases of "libido") in the widest sense of the term, functional, formal and final represent respectively 1) the will to be effective, 2) the will to be mature, and 3) the will to be confident (the will to believe). The values which correspond to them are 1) effectiveness, 2) maturity and 3) faith.

Effectiveness not only under favoring conditions but also in the face of obstacles and difficulties gives one a sense of life's potentialities and the ability to render them actual. When one is endowed with normal health, ability to get along with people and a fair degree of mastery in some technique, he has a chance to make himself useful and play his part as a social being at the same time that he can satisfy his physical needs. But in all too many instances these conditions do not obtain. The problem then arises of being an effective person despite handicaps. The case of Helen Keller is of course an extreme case so/^{is}that of Franz Rosenzweig. But there are numerous unheralded and unknown examples of such ability to life effectively, not of course as effectively as those who are without handicaps, but nevertheless to a sufficient degree to indicate that the will to maximum life can make itself felt.

But effectiveness as such is only one aspect of salvation, and by itself of neutral significance. It is as capable of manifesting itself destructively as well as creatively. If it is to function creatively and to avoid the danger of being weakened or functioning disastrously, the will to maximum life must express itself, in addition, as the will to maturity. The will to maturity functions as reason or intelligence. It is a conscious effort at growth and departure from infantilism. That most people fail to attain the ability to think or live rationally means that they suffer arrested mental growth. Hence we have most people laboring under fixations, regressions, masochism, sadism, etc. To live and think rationally or intelligently involves a hatred of waste, cruelty, falsehood and ugliness even when they flatter one's infantile ways of being effective. It means having a sense of reality that is too honest to permit one to deceive or delude oneself or others.

It means having a sense of justice and goodness that prevents one from being egocentric. It means having a sense of proportion and a sense of humor, etc.

And finally to achieve salvation the will to maximum life must express itself as the will to believe in the inherent meaning of existence and in the ultimate vindication of its trend toward human self fulfillment. Self, humanity (in the sense of differentia and of ultimate unity) and God are objects of faith. Without faith in what they represent the struggle from infantilism to maturity which mankind has been waging since its coming upon the scene of history would seem to be hopeless. When we speak of history we imply that there came a time in the life of the human race when it began to feel the need for growth. That was the awakening of the will to maturity. It is quite dormant in the world. Those in whom that will is awake, to appreciate the significance of their own state of mind and to view the career of mankind as history, that is as a story of growth or of movement in the direction of a better and higher order of life, must exert the will to faith in God, man and self.

In Genesis there is a text which might very well serve as a peg in which to hang the foregoing thought. Abraham's life is summed up in the phrase (p.197)

. Since it is apparently the Torah's purpose to state that Abraham lived a full life or the life abundant, we have in that phrase a description of what constitutes a full life. First, it is marked by a sense of effectiveness. This is implied in "good old age" which refers to Abraham's having enjoyed of the world's goods of health, possessions and children, and to his having led a useful career. Secondly it is a life marked by a sense of maturity and wisdom. This is conveyed in the word ~~conveyed~~ And finally . He died satisfied that the future would witness the fulfilment of the hope on which he had built his life.

*

*

*

Thursday, November 6, 1941

The question: which group of interests, the basis or the final, should be dealt with first in soterics, is not merely a question of methodology. It is a question which approach is more in keeping with the very nature of the problem

and is more likely to lead to a fruitful solution. It is therefore important to reckon with the principle stated by Aristotle in his *Ethics* VII, 8 which reads as follows: "No more in ethics than in mathematics are the first principles imparted by reasoning, but by virtue, whether natural or produced by habituation in right opinion as to the first principle." The first principle referred to by Aristotle is "that for the sake of which" or final cause. The point which he makes is, accordingly, that virtue (=conduct leading to salvation) cannot be shown as arising logically out of the basic interests but rather out of the final interests which are acquired through the process of habituation or training. The case of the final interests is analogous to "the assumptions of the existence of the primary objects of mathematics such as the straight line or the unit" (McKeons interpretation ad loc.) Likewise it is necessary to assume the validity of the values "personality, humanity and God, and sufficient habituation in those values to render them operative before we can discuss profitably the problem of soterics. Hence the discussion following the identification of the will to maximum life must begin with the treatment of the final interests.

The will to live is the principle of self preservation which operates in all living organisms except man without awareness of its object. Not only does it operate in various interests which in those organisms are only a functional character, but it also in the centripetal tendency of each organism to maintain its integrity, individuality and character. When in man the will to live becomes to will to maximum life this centripetal tendency of the organism is transformed into the final interest of personality. As such personality is not confined to the body, though it treats it as a point of reference (cf. Bergson, *Morality and Religion*, 246)

The approach of soterics to the study of its objective is necessarily different from that of a descriptive science. In a descriptive science we proceed in the description from the lower to the higher ~~stages~~ stages indicating each step in the development. In soterics which is a normative science we must begin by defining the purpose to be achieved in the striving for maximum life. That purpose has to be stated with all the comprehensiveness and explicitness made possible by the

contemporaneous stage of cultural development. L. Itobhouse compares the different stages in the evolution of the mind to distinct phases in the apprehension of a syllogism. The lowest stage he compares to a syllogism in which the conclusion alone is grasped, the second stage to one in which thought has come upon the minor premise, and the third stage to one in which the major premise is fully grasped. The will to salvation operates as a unit in all the three parts of the syllogism and its progress in self awareness progresses along the lines suggested by Hobhouse. But when we want to reproduce the process leading to salvation we must necessarily set down first the major premise. That premise consists of the final interests, the minor premise consists of the formal interests and the conclusion consists of the actual disposition or satisfaction of the functional interests. It therefore follows that we have to begin the consideration of the factors involved in the achievement of salvation with a study of the belief in God, humanity and personality.

The soterical consciousness at the present time postulates a conception of human nature which makes all the world kin. The credit for the most explicit and comprehensive conception of humanity in the past is due to none other than the Stoic philosophers, and it is to their influence that the Judeo-Christian tradition is indebted for as much of that universal conception it succeeded in assimilating. In actuality that tradition harbored an element of exclusiveness that virtually denied salvation to all outside their respective communions. The Stoics clearly promulgated the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. All races, nationalities and castes were recognized by them as coming under the application of the same moral law. The slave was regarded as possessing moral equality with his master. Of course the very institution of slavery was a limitation on that equality. But for that matter it was not the Judeo-Christian tradition that demanded the abolition of slavery. Paul insisted upon the slave's obeying his master.

On the other hand the new doctrine of a common humanity advanced by the Stoics did not come from the mere goodness of their hearts. It was the only doctrine suitable to the Roman empire in which political dislocation led to the denationalizing of the ancient peoples and the individual human being was thrown on his own

mental and moral resources. If we are in a position to postulate in a deeper and even more extensive sense the common humanity of all men, it is because technological development has brought about a sense of interdependence which could never have been even contemplated in the past. The goal of a common humanity has come to be a vital necessity, however remote the day of its actual achievement may be.

"The full meaning of the humanitarian principle," says L. T. Hobhouse, "is to conceive of this growth, (the growth of the human species) as a whole as the end and aim of all human effort, and to judge existing conceptions of right and wrong thereby" (Mind in Evolution 387) and further he adds "humanity is the object of man...the business of the human race is to work out all that it has in it to be. In this conception the social structure and even the current morality are treated as servants rather than as matters of human life" (389)

Is the foregoing description of the sense of humanity as at present more capable of being experienced by reason of the proximity and interdependence into which technology has brought all members of the human species compatible with Bergson's contention in his "Morality and Obligation" that the sense of humanity can be accounted for only as the revelation of a few gifted mystics, and that it would never have developed naturally through sheer extension of scope of each constituent group. It must be remembered that although ~~Berke~~ Bergson ascribes the awareness of humanity to the revelation experienced by a few mystics, he maintains that all human beings possess that sense at least in potentia, else they would not respond to the mystics appeal (ibid. p. 90). That being the case, all that Bergson contributes to the discussion is that a sense of humanity cannot be accounted for as a logical development out of group loyalty. It belongs to a different category of thought and life. This fact is sufficiently covered in the basic plan underlying Soterics, in that the sense of humanity is not treated as one of the formal interests, but rather as one of the final interests, on a par with personality and God. The case with the final interests generally is that they are experienced and revealed by individuals in whom the will to maximum life functions

at far higher power tension, soto speak, than in the mass of mankind. Nevertheless it must be assumed that all human beings are potentially capable of experiencing the final interests, else there would be no hope for humanity. That faith in the potentiality of all hyman beings attaining the status of prophets is the mystic's contribution to religion and the life of mankind. Moses, or whoever wrote in his name, certainly believed it when he ~~xx~~ said: would that all the people of YWH were prophets!

* * * *

Friday, November 7, 1941

Apropos of the question of approach, additional evidence of the need of dealing first with the final interests comes from the recent testimony of psychiatrists. They seem to find that Freud was mistaken in limiting psychoanalysis to instinctivistic and genetic psychology and failing to realize that the later peculiarities are nothing more than regression to infantile drives or reactions. The general trend which was inaugurated with Otto Rank seems to be now to trance neurotic conflicts to cultural conditions. The moment we look to a cultural orientation to account for neurosis we necessarily invade the domain of final and formal interests and begin to realize that therapy must begin by disentangling the cultural knots which present conditions found in the mental life of vast numbers of people. It is from that end, viz the cultural interests therefore that we must begin when we want to develop a system of soterics that shall guide us in living normally and in reconstructing the various institutions of society with a view to their furthering instead of hindering the attainment of salvation.

One of the principal contributing factors in the modern world in the increase of neuroses is undoubtedly the conflict of cultures due to the fact that ancient cultures refuse to die and that modern cultures out of deference to the ancient cultures reufse to function to full capacity. The ancient cultures are Judaism and Christianity that have to pose as religions in order not to appear as fulfilling the same functions as the national cultures by which citizens of modern states must

live. These national cultures, either sincerely or mistakenly accept this modus vivendi and apparently forego having anything to do with religion. This is an impossible modus vivendi. It conflicts with all the principles of the individual and collective mind. Religion, which fosters the final interests of human life cannot prove the basis of unity unless those who profess have other interests, i.e. functional interests in common. (This will become evident when we discuss the final interests). Judaism and Christianity, especially when they are transformed from other worldly to this worldly cultures, are faced with the fact that their respective traditions have their roots in an ancient environment, i.e. in functional interests that grew out of the life conditions of ancient Palestine. Normally, Judaism sought to retire to Palestine and there reconstruct itself so that it shall be relevant to the new Jewish life which is arising there. As for Christianity there is no legitimate place for it in human life any longer, since historically it was either the continuation of Roman imperialism or an other worldly cult. Neither purpose has any longer a place in human society. But if Judaism were to retire and Christianity were to disappear, American life ought to evolve a religion that could take the place left empty by their removal from the American scene. That American life is far from being either qualified or prepared for such a development is quite apparent. One would certainly not want to have an American duplicate of nazism. But a religion that shall be both national in form and universal in content is way beyond the comprehension of even the most enlightened Americans. The upshot is that for a long time to come Americans to have anything like universal perspective will have to be cultural hyphenates, without understanding the implication of such hyphenism. This lack of understanding is bound to result in all kinds of mental conflicts and neuroses. Jews and Catholics are likely to be among the principal victims. For that reason it is necessary that we follow the lead of present day psychiatry and approach the problems of soterics first from the side of the cultural interests.

Among the formal interests, which are the expression of the will to maturity, the truth interest is of coordinate significance with the goodness interest. The most difficult phase of the truth interest is that which pertains to human life and especially to one's inner self. Hence the greatest step forward in the maturing of the race took place when Freud discovered the place of unconscious motivations in human conduct.

* * * *

Saturday night, November 8, 1941

The concept of humanity as one of the three groups of final interests should be interpreted as signifying that the very crux and center of the problem of salvation is the matter of human relationships. The realization of this fact constitutes the radical departure from the assumption which prevailed in the past. According to that assumption the crux of the problem of salvation is the matter of man's relation to God. According to various sceptual and individualistic conceptions of salvation such as those of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Sterner the matter of man's relation to himself is at the heart of that problem. The question which is the correct assumption might have been debated indefinitely from a philosophic standpoint. Fortunately, however, science has advanced sufficiently to cast a deciding vote. Psychoanalysis is gradually learning that the main cause of neuroses is not as its first discoverers Freud and Adler maintained, to be sought in the disturbances of the inherited or biological needs or instincts but in the disturbances of human relationships. Neuroses represent the extreme form of frustration and despair of salvation. Since the disturbance of human relationships are the chief cause of neuroses, it follows that the avoidance of such disturbances is the most indispensable prerequisite to the attainment of salvation. This fact is instinctively emphasized in the ideals of justice and love which the historical religions have at least theoretically and in their prophets, also practically emphasize as the primary conditions to the achievement of salvation.

Since human relationships are at the center of the problem of salvation, and since salvation is to mean for us the conquest of fear and the maximum actualization of potentialities, the question arises how large an area of human relationships is necessary for the achievement of salvation? Hitherto it was some people, church or nation that constituted an adequate area. Bitter experience has proved up to the hilt the tragic fallacy of such assumptions. The reduction of the planet to a single neighborhood has rendered all of mankind as the area within which the human relationships of every human being must be normalized, if we are to be emancipated from the besetting anxieties that stand in the way of salvation.

The will to live, even in the lowest forms of life, functions in ambivalent fashion, as urges or drives accompanied by emotional experiences of pleasure in their gratification and as fears and its emotional offspring such as hate, etc. directed toward whatever object interfere with the gratification of the urge. With the limited mental capacity of the animal, only actually present objects which interfere with the gratification of the urge evoke fear, hate etc. In man the will to live augmented by the various powers of mind and of communication, finds expression in fear, hate etc. evoked by imagined possibilities of interference with the gratification of his urges. By the same token he imagines various means of conquering these fears. If those means were potent the equilibrium between fear and remedy would be maintained. Actually what happens is that while the fears may in most instances be warranted the remedies turn out to be futile. The will to salvation is the general term for the process of human life whereby man achieves a closer approximation in fitting his remedy to the fear, either by his eliminating the fear or his securing a genuine remedy for overcoming it. An illustration of eliminating fear is the cessation of belief in evil spirits as putative cause of disease; an illustration of fitting the remedy to the fear is finding a genuine cure for many a disease.

Fear of insecurity grows with progress and complexity of human life. Hence the objective of the will to maximum life can never be static; it is bound to be dynamic. It is this fact about the will to salvation which not only necessitates the function-

ing of final interests but which also compels us to regard these final interests not as static or attainable goals but rather as "regulative principles."

But the will to salvation cannot be content with the mere overcoming of fears. The very ability which man displays in overcoming the more intense and complex fears reveals to him unsuspected potentialities of a creative character, which when realized give rise to goods inherently worthwhile. This is the creative aspect of salvation, which led the ancients to picture life in the hereafter not merely as secure existence but as bliss or as basking in the glory of God.

* * *

Monday, November 10, 1941

The will to salvation requires daager, struggle, difficulty, pain as fire needs fuel. The analogy can be carried a step further. As fire dies out when the fuel gives out, as it burns weakly when the fuel is diminished, and as it is choked by an overabundance of fuel, so the effects of absence of evil, of a small amount of evil or of too much evil on the will to live are respectively to cause it to atrophy, to function weakly or to be choked completely. Concretely the will to salvation as it expresses itself in the functional interests is the will to achieve power over want, sickness, decay and death, over neglect and hostility, over being ineffectual and suffering boredom. The need, which is the emotional aspect of each interest is itself a compound feeling, compounded of actual pain which has to be removed, of anticipated gratification and of fear of frustration. The least obstacle not only prolongs the pain and extinguishes the anticipated gratification but also brings into relief the fear of frustration. Since obstacles to the satisfaction of interests or to the will to live in general are the very fuel on which that will or those interests feed, and without which they would die of inaction, the element of fear is necessarily predominant in the will to salvation in general, or in each of its particular interests.

The question then is: Is the will to salvation only a matter of overcoming all possible fears which the human being by reason of his keen awareness and highly complex existence is heir to? Or is it in addition also the realization of creative

potentialities apart from the conquest of fear? That creative potentialities are in some way related to fears is quite apparent, since in the effort to overcome the various evils that threaten to destroy life, man evolves outer tools and inner attitudes that enable him to avert them. But what we want to know is would man discover in himself any creative potentialities apart from the stimulus of the threats that hang over his head? The answer is certainly not. To understand the matter of creative potentialities, it is necessary to bear in mind first that the initial impulse to any human potentiality comes from evil or the fear of evil; secondly that man is endowed with an excess of energy, particularly mental. When that energy is once started into action by some initial impulse emanating from pain, danger, etc a goodly part of it keeps on functioning long after the pain subsides, the danger overcome and the need satisfied. Out of this surplus energy with the creative potentialities it harbors man has constructed cultures, religious civilisations, which like all luxuries which he becomes accustomed to, develop into necessities which extend the range of his hunger and therefore of the will to salvation.

There is no such thing, therefore, as a static attainment of salvation. To be equal to the implications of his surplus energy in terms of creative potentialities and ever widening scope of life, man has come to regard growth itself as an indispensable factor for salvation. He has acquired the conscious need of ~~feeding~~ finding something new all the time to learn and to master, new perceptions, new comprehensions, new insights, ever increasing relationships among the different parts of reality and experience, ~~an~~ increasing capacity in doing things, increasing sensitivity in appreciating values and differences between values. The entire range of formal interests which are synonymous with a life of reason comes within the process of ~~growth~~ growth which man has learned to regard as indispensable, if he is to achieve salvation in a progressively richer existence which he must learn to make his own or lose his soul.

"The earth belongs to the Lord and all earth holds, the world and its inhabitants." The psalmist probably meant to express by this verse nothing more than the general idea that God possesses all that there is. But what did he want the reader to

infer from this fact? That God can wreak his will upon the world and its inhabitants? Hardly that. In view of what follows which describes the kind of man who is worthy of ascending God's hill, it would seem that the psalmist wants the reader to realize that everything which exists, including men and their ways, constitute God's kingdom or field of action. From the standpoint of salvation, this implication of the psalmists' statement is the one to be stressed in the conception of God as the power that makes for salvation. The tragedy of religion has been man's tendency to abstract God from the everyday realities of life other than those which, in his primitive thinking, he regarded as harboring dangers beyond his control. Realities like plagues, enemies, death by which he was ever surrounded were regarded by him as occasions for calling on God. But the ordinary pursuits and pleasures, the affairs of mine and thine, of social intercourse and banter, the world of small kindnesses and petty strifes and jealousies he treated as something that constituted a kind of limbo which was not to be invaded by God. God was only in temples and churches visiting the world on Sabbath and holydays when men and women were dressed in all their fineries and everybody was on his good behavior.

On the principle that no interest is conducive to salvation, unless suffused by something of every other interest, the conception of God is empty of all content and meaning, unless it is so closely identified with the functional interests as to include "everyone and everything -- all interests, all commerce, all government, all art, all amusements, all staid pursuits of the old and all the ardor of the young, all sport, all laughter, all that makes for gladness." It is only as we succeed in identifying the business of daily living, striving and pleasuring as God's kingdom that we can hope to expel from our lives the element of fear that robs us of all joy in what we have, makes us envious of what others^{have} and destroys all likelihood of our making the most of our opportunities.

Moreover we must remember that not only the world but also its inhabitants are the Lord's. No life can have no meaning to any one of us apart from his family, his employers, his community, his country, and in the final analysis mankind. These are all to be viewed as members of God's kingdom, and our relation to God

or membership in that kingdom can be expressed in no other way than through the medium of our responsibilities to our fellowmen who inhabit it. "If I forget them I forget God, God expressing himself to me through men in general as through my family and my employers in particular."

* * * *

Tuesday, November 11, 1941

If we want that the final values, particularly the idea of God should not remain abstract, but be identified with the everyday interests and problems of human life, then we must make provision that they keep pace with the development of that life. The final values were originally articulated in terms of the actual experiences which people incurred in the course of their efforts to satisfy their functional needs. The ideas of personality, society and God gave significance to the lives of the primitives because those ideas referred to their daily occupations and concerns, to their actual wants and dangers. Whether it was hunting or sowing or reaping or fighting, there was always some rite or taboo connected with whatever they were engaged in. That rite or taboo, implicitly or explicitly, made the individual aware of his responsibility to the group, thereby bringing to the fore of his consciousness the sense of his own individuality as well as that of an order of existence that transcends individual whim, in other words, personality and God.

The fatal element in human nature is the tendency of a habit to outlive its usefulness. This is responsible for the lag in cultural and religious development. After the first stages in his history man's development is uneven. His functional interests grow in scope and in efficiency of attainment due to the inglorious tools man devises. But his formal and final interests instead of keeping pace with the functional and being readjusted to fit the new ways ~~in~~ in which man fights poverty and disease, organizes his social activities, etc., are permitted to function as though nothing happened. The result is a dualism in which the formal and final interests are avowed and pursued as though they constituted a world by themselves,

and the functional interests which occupy the bulk of men's energies and endeavors are subjected to no criterion other than the satisfactions which they themselves yield, or the frustrations which result from their being hindered. This dualism takes the form of otherworldliness for the formal and final interests, and this worldliness for the functional interests, the former being the Lord's domain and the latter Caesar's domain.

That kind of dualism obtained during the Christian centuries of pre-industrial Europe. With the industrialization of western mankind something happened which may be said to represent an urge to restore the organic character of man's interests. The main effect of the machine process was a more thoroughgoing division of labor. The division of labor in turn leads to the growth of interdependence and the suppression of individuality and difference. Out of these conditions have come the upheavals in society which have brought to the surface the two great movements, nationalism and socialism. So revolutionary are these movements in their approach to human life that apart from the specific purposes they seek to achieve in the field of functional interests, they are bent upon restoring the organic character of human life. This is how nationalism and socialism have come to spell new religions for their adherents in that the final and formal values which they stress are no longer those which have come down from the past, but those which grow naturally out of, or those which inherently pertain to the functional interests, the pursuit of which it is the purpose of these movements to render as effective as possible.

On the other hand there is in these movements the very real danger that the formal and final interests might acquire a purely decorative function, namely that of lending glamor and prestige to the functional interests which would henceforth be pursued without the restraining influence of independent norms and criteria, i.e. independent from the standpoint of their objectivity, of the desires of powerful individuals or cliques. That this danger is all too imminent is amply demonstrated by what has happened in the totalitarian countries, both fascist and communist. The following is the nazi creed which is given in the form of a catechism and quoted in the N.Y. Times, Tuesday, Nov. 11, p. 9: "The divine manifests itself

in the cosmos, in nature animate and inanimate...The divine in the highest form is personified in the (German) people because; 1. The individual, in accordance with nature, represents the only means of life and being for the people. 2. Because the people is a vital unit of men willed by nature or the divine. 3. Because only within his people can he develop his divine faculties and energies, or, rather, only in the people can he live. To believe in our people and its mission means: 1. To have unshakable conviction that our people represent the highest worth of all humanity on earth. 2. To follow the will of nature, according to which the best people is called upon the command. 3. To know that to be led by the best people redounds, from the necessity of things, in benediction to other nations. 4. To work, sacrifice ourselves and fight indefatigably for the ascent and victory of our people." (The foregoing was broadcast by the Vatican radio as a quotation from the German weekly Nordland organ of the "German believers in God.")

The success of both nationalism and socialism is due to their ability to bring about the restoration, even if it be only in spurious fashion, of the organic character of human interests. In contrast note the futility of the liberals who finding the medieval dualism untenable merely translate it into modern terminology, instead of attempting to find a new synthesis. The philosophy of the liberals resolves itself into a dualism between the man and the machine. They view modern life as a struggle between the two. "Man with his songs and prayers, Shakespeare and Job, tavern days and Talmud nights, folk dances and Sabbath feasts on the one side -- and the machine with money power on the other," writes Marvin Lowenthal (Men. Jnl. Vii, 1) This kind of dualism is no improvement on the medieval one. What we need is an organic synthesis of man and the machine, but it must be a genuine synthesis. The only test of genuineness is coordinate significance to each of the three categories of interests which enter into the synthesis. The attempt to assign primacy to one at the expense of the others cannot result in a genuine synthesis.

Wednesday, November 12, 1941

To make sure that we reckon soterically with whatever interest we are in the process of fulfilling it is important to bear in mind the referential character of such interest. On the basic assumption that all the interests are merely differentiations of the will to salvation their organic relation to another is expressed by means of their representational character. The final and the formal interests must therefore be viewed as referring to each other, and both to the functional interests. We can well conceive the functional interests as being pursued without any reference to either formal or final interests. In that case, however, they would be merely differentiations of the will to live but not of the will to salvation.

When the principle of reference operates not from one group of interests to another, but within each group itself, it becomes a principle of polarity. The principle of polarity as applied to somatic interests may mean taking care that either the somatic or the mental interests be not disregarded, and vice versa. As applied to the interests of truth it may mean reckoning with either goodness, utility or beauty and vice versa. As applied to faith in God it means supplementing the notion of him as transcendent with all the notion of him as immanent either in humanity or in the individual, and so all along the line.

The principle of polarity as applied to personality calls for a proper understanding of the theory of natural and imprescriptible rights. That theory is at the basis of democracy. It helps us realize that from the standpoint of salvation democracy is essentially superior to other forms of government. The fact that in practice the democracy has not worked well is largely due to a misapprehension of natural rights, a missapprehension which is responsible for the policy of *laissez faire* with all the evils in its train. The conception of natural rights which goes together with the failure to apply the principle of polarity to the individual is interpreted as implying that there is an inherent apportion between political power and individual liberty. "The opposite strain in the theory of civil liberties," says John Dewey (Social Frontier, Feb. 1936) "is indicated by the contrast between the word "civil" on the one hand and

and the words 'natural' and 'political' on the other. The term civil is directly connected with the idea of citizenship. On this basis civil liberties are those which belong to citizens as such and are different both from those which individuals are supposed to possess in a state of nature and from political rights such as the franchise and the right to hold office. Upon this basis the justification for the various civil liberties is the contribution they make to the welfare of the community." Insofar as Dewey agrees with Homes and Brandeis that free inquiry and free discussion should be defended on the ground of their indispensable value to the normal development of public welfare and not upon anything inherent in the individual as such, he applies the principle of polarity to the concept of personality. The other pole in this instance is the community in ~~which~~ which 'humanity' functions. He reinforces his reckoning with the principle of polarity by reckoning also with the principle of reference as when he adds: "The only hope for liberalism is to surrender, in theory and practice, the doctrine that liberty is a full fledged ready made possession of individuals, independent of social institutions and arrangements, and to realize that social control, especially of economic forces, is necessary in order to render secure the liberties of the individual including civil liberties." (ibid.)

* * * *

Thursday, November 13, 1941

A very significant statement is that made by L. T. Hobhouse to the effect that "the nature of the will is to respond to such conceptions of the good as it can form (Social Development, 339) and in propounding to it an ideal as really good we are at once stimulating the will and maintaining that because our ideal (accepting the common good of humanity as our aim) is valid it will be found in the long run to appeal to it." There is in this statement a number of implications of a soterical character. The assumption that the will inherently responds to such conception of the good as it can form illustrates the specific nature of the will to salvation in a number of ways: 1) The notion that it is part of the will to salvation to form a conception of the good, i.e. to act not merely because it is

impelled by any particular drive or hunger but also because it has some glimmering of a totality which is to be satisfied; 2) the very nature of the will is to respond to and not to disregard whatever good it envisages. This implies that the good envisaged and the response to it are to be viewed merely as different phases of the same psychic event. Otherwise we would have to assume a gap between the will and whatever good it envisages, with nothing necessarily compelling the will to bridge the gap. This indeed is the popular conception of will, as in the statement "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." In fact we find ourselves going over ~~an~~ again the ground traversed by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle on the question whether knowledge leads to virtue. No particular idea of the good guarantees its fulfilment but the will which has of its own accord worked through the maze of experience and habit and has arrived at what it regards as its true good is bound to carry it into effect. If the good remains unattained it is either because there was not a genuine will toward it, or some external obstacle too strong for the will to overcome has intervened.

A further implication emerges from the above statement of Hobhouse's particularly if it is joined to the basic idea of his book which is summarized in the following: "From obscene impulses and narrow interests we have traced the advance of mind to clear ideas, wider social relations, comprehensive ends and enhanced powers" (ibid 338) That mind is inherently so constituted as to evolve along the lines indicated and that by permitting their inner movement to continue we are bound to arrive at progressively conceptions of the good which the will must necessarily feel impelled to achieve is what we essentially mean when we speak of the existence of a power that makes for salvation and we name that power God.

* * * *

Friday, November 14, 1941

The essence of fruitful thinking is asking the proper question. The Hebrew saying (p.209) points to an appreciation of the art of questioning which if it had been applied to things instead of to words might have yielded some of the most startling discoveries of truth. One of the main purposes of

soterics should be to help us cultivate the art of questioning from the standpoint of salvation. How the wrong questions are bound to put us off the track may be illustrated by the following:

In a paper entitled "Moral and Spiritual Forces in the War" by Charles R. Brown, Dean of the Yale School of Religion and published in 1918, the writer says: "When the war came men began to ask, sometimes with a sneer, and sometimes with a look of pain 'Why did not Christianity prevent the war?' It never seemed to occur to anyone to ask 'Why did not Science prevent the war?' No one supposed that Science would or could. It was the most scientific nation on earth which brought on the war. It never occurred to anyone to ask 'Why did not big business or the newspapers or the universities prevent the war?' No one supposed that commerce, or the press or education could avert such disasters. These useful forms of social energy are not strong enough. They do not go deep enough in the lives of men to curb those forces of evil which let loose upon the world this frightful war. It was a magnificent tribute which men paid to the might of spiritual forces when they ask, sometimes wistfully and sometimes scornfully 'Why did not Christianity prevent the war?'"

Precisely that is the trouble with human life is that people do not ask "Why did not science or big business or the newspapers or the universities prevent the war?" and instead keep on asking the wrong question, which indicates that they hold assumptions and expectations which condemn human life to irredeemable confusion and helplessness. That which Dean Brown glories in -- the tribute "paid to the might of spiritual forces" is what he should deplore. That tribute is based on a complete misunderstanding of the nature and operation of the spiritual forces. It implies that they are something independent and apart from science, and big business and newspapers and universities. What utter nonsense the writer is led into by his false dichotomy, when to account for the fact that no one even supposes that commerce or the press or education could avert war, he has to describe those useful forms of social ~~max~~ energy as weak and superficial! Could anything be further from the truth? Could the so called "spiritual forces" as the writer conceives them ever hope to compare with these activities in power and depth?

The truth is that so long as men do not know enough to ask the very questions which Dean Brown dismisses as irrelevant, there will be no end to war and the threat of war. Hence the need for soterics to help us to understand life and the conditions necessary to its enhancement that we shall know to put it the kind of questions which will elicit fruitful answers. For lack of the proper understanding of spiritual forces and their manner of operation. Dean Brown failed to realize what lay behind Germany's aggression and he consoles himself with the merest shadow of an illusion about the efficacy of spiritual forces. In a desperate attempt to discover some trace of such efficacy he cat ches on a straw. Not all is lost, he argues, so long as even the military caste in Potsdam has to try to save its face by trying to make it appear that the war is one of self-defense thrust upon them by unscrupulous enemies. In contrast with men's attitude during the Napoleonic wars when war was taken for granted, he is convinced that now the moral sense of the race is arrayed against war." As Dean of a Religious School he should have known enough about B rnhardi and Treitsche and Nietzsche and the other philosophical gangsters to realize that a transvaluation of values was taking place which would not only take war for granted but exalt it as offering the opportunity for the highest self realization of human life. He would then have understood that "the spiritual forces" were being used deliberately as sheep's clothng to hide the wolf. That kind of use to which spiritual force are put there is little to be grateful for.

* * * *

Friday, November 21, 1941

One of the main implications of the soterical approach to the will to salvation is the self existence of the three groups of values which correspond to the three categories of needs and drives. The self existence of the functional values is objective, of the rational values ideal and of the spiritual or final values in a state of becoming. The point of this statement is that the soterical approach negates the assumption that rational and spiritual values are subjective and psychological creations.s I hold with Nicolai Hartmann that the rational values of the good are just self-existent as the rational values of the true, namely those of

mathematics and logic. How does this follow however from the soterical approach? The answer is: Since the will to salvation is the will to make the most of life, the implication ~~sixt~~ is that whatever life aspires is driven to is necessarily something actual or potential in the very nature of reality logically prior or antecedent to the actual of life. For if it were not thus antecedent the would be lacking. The very realization of the difference between what is more life and what is less life is based upon a criteria that is logically independent of life. Thus the aspiration to truth could not exist unless truth were self existent.

It seems to me that there is something to the science of Being. Since we have to distinguish between objective existence, ideal self-existence, potential existence, and becoming-existence, it is necessary to set forth the conditions which determine every one of those ~~types~~ types of being.

Chapter II

The will to salvation as the material cause of salvation (making the most out of life) is involved affirmatively and negatively in whatever we experience (think, feel or act) as its substratum, insofar as that experience differentiates us from other living creatures. This material cause has been designated by medical philosophers as will, by Nietzsche as will to power, by Freud as libido.

I

Human thought, feeling and action can grow indefinitely in scope. Thanks to man's capacity for self-consciousness or ability to remember, imagine (abstract and synthesize) and communicate with his fellows. Thus self-consciousness opens up vast and unexplored areas of possibilities of life for the individual and the group. This is the life abundant or maximum life. In its very nature such life is a process and not an attainment. But for pre-modern man with his tendency on the whole to reify processes into static conditions, salvation (life abundant) constituted attainment which was pictured variously in this world or in the next. (Exceptional tendencies may be noted as in the principle "panta rhei" of Heraclitus and the rabbinic statement "ain lohem menhah" (Ber. 64).

Life abundant is essentially growth. Man differs from the rest of creation in

not being entirely limited by the data of his existence. He can not only further and modify the growth of plants and animals by means of special cultivation, grafting and breeding. He can also further and modify his own growth as a human being by means of environmental changes and educational processes to such an extent as to overcome in progressive measure the limitations implied in the data of his existence. Overcoming causists either in transforming or transcending limitations, of which the fact of death is the most challenging. Self-identification of individual with group and of group with humanity is indispensable both to the transformation and transcendence of limitations.

To maintain the process of continuous growth man has to be forever engaged in reconstructing himself and his environment. Whereas other creatures begin and end with the same fund of transmitted interests and capacities, man envisages indefinite increase of that fund. Progress in knowledge of human nature is to be counted on for achieving effective methods of education and self improvement. This applies also to reconstruction of social heritage. On the other hand, the reconstruction of environment which until modern times proceeded slowly has been given by technology a momentum which promises far reaching improvements in the outward conditions of living.

II

Man's will to salvation (growth) is genetically a recent development in his will to live which has behind it all the momentum of biological heredity. Only in comparatively recent times has man begun to react to situations not with the undivided will of the animal but with an ambivalent will in which both "life" and "abundant life" figure as objectives. This fact has been noted and reckoned with in all the religions and ethical systems. They have suggested and devised various principles and disciplines to deal with this ambivalence of the human will in order to reenforce the aspect of the will to life abundant. They are based for the most part on the reification of each of the two aspects of the human will by representing them ~~as~~ respectively as the good inclination and the ~~ix~~ evil inclination.

Actually all so called instances of inner conflict or divided will are not the clashing of two distinct wills; they constitute what may be termed the dialectic process of the will to salvation, for life abundant like life in general harbors its own contradiction or inner resistance.

The will to live requires resistance both inner and outer as fire needs fuel. But if the fire is not to be choked by the fuel, the latter must be of a particular amount and quality. The same is true of the will to salvation. Its sine qua non is the resistance to it present in all forms of danger, hardship, struggle and pain and in all occasions for inner conflict and frustration. The high suicide rate in San Diego, Calif. was ascribed to too much sunshine. As it operates in the functional interests it implies combating want, sickness, decay and death, neglect and hostility, ignorance and boredom. In the formal (rational) interests it operates as struggle against all kinds of irrationalities in thought, action and emotion. In the ways of human life, in its institutions and cultures. In the final (spiritual) interests it operates against all tendencies to negate individuality, humanity and God.

III

Resistance to the will to salvation may reach a breaking point at which the will is rendered impotent. Such impotence reduces to living on the low gear of mere biological will to life. If they have had a taste of what salvation means, their frustration leads them to question the value of life. "Most men live lives of quiet desperation." (For statistical study of problem of "Suicide" by Cavan).

Suicide is as distinctive of man as is the will to salvation in that it is the expression of a will to death, and death as a deliberate objective only the human being can aim at. Some animals when in the agony of physical pain resort to violent actions of a reflex character without any conception of what those actions would lead to. The violence of those actions might cause death; but that is not suicide. When a person who suffers excruciating torment puts an end to his ~~life~~ life his action is very largely of the same type as the foregoing, though he may be aware that it will result in death. But it is not the suicide that negates life or salvation. Neither is self execution of the kind in vogue in oriental countries.

Neither is martyrdom; on the contrary, martyrdom is the most intense affirmation of life and salvation.

Suicide which is the absolute negation of life and salvation is a ~~concomitant~~ concomitant of personal disorganization. Where personal disorganization is frequent it is a symptom of social disorganization. In a normally functioning society suicide is condemned as being self murder. When committed by a sane person who does not suffer from intolerable physical pain, it is interpreted as a denial of the spiritual (final) values which it is the business of religion and positive morality to uphold. But in periods of social crisis when the authority of society upon the individual is weakened due to inner or outer conflict or to the failure of society to come to the aid of the individual, two factors making for suicide arise: 1) the individual is rendered helpless in the face of overwhelming odds, and 2) the restraining influence of society against suicide is relaxed.

Saturday, November 22, 1941

IV

With so much resistance, both inner and outer, to the will to salvation leading to frustration we come up against the problem of evil. Most attempts to account for the existence of evil emanate from the desire to have the formal and final interests fall into a harmonious pattern. That desire itself is an integral part of those interests. But it is no more possible to account for evil than to account for life, for darkness, for light, for growth (salvation) than for frustration (damnation). Good and evil are the two sides of the same shield; one is as inconceivable without the other as a surface without another side to it. Hence in a metaphysical version of reality, which is the version that would have to be given from the standpoint of the will to salvation as the material cause of salvation, the place of evil is different from what it is in a religious version of reality which is given from the standpoint of the final interests represented by the values personality, humanity and God.

The problem of salvation (growth) consists neither in finding a way of explaining the existence of evil nor of seeking its complete elimination, but of keeping it down to a point of equilibrium with the power of the will to salvation and in

raising that point to ever higher levels. Each such level represents a more complex form of life. Equilibrium is obtained either through conquest or through transcendence of evil. Conquest is reducing the evil; transcendence is raising the power of will.

A prerequisite to the progressive conquest or transcendence of evil is immediate awareness of the inexhaustible potentialities that inhere in the human will to live. Man is stimulated to activate those potentialities when he is reminded that he possesses more energy than he usually exerts or lives on. Examples of self control, endurance, courage, kindness, self-sacrifice etc. point to the large reserve of will to salvation which human beings possess. Whatever shuts out that awareness, as does the suggestion of defeatism and suicide, depresses the will to salvation. (Classic instances are: Hegesias' elegiac eloquence and "Werther Leiden"). Susceptibility of the will to salvation to edifying or depressing examples indicates its high tension which in a sense is its very essence. If we may view any living organism as organized matter in a state of tension, then the will to salvation may be viewed as the high state of tension/^{of}the human organism.

V

Reckoning with the material cause of salvation enables us to see in a new light the nature of both the ethical and the spiritual values. Whence arises the imperative character of the ethical values, and whence the endorsement character of the final values? Religionists point to supernatural revelation for an answer and philosophers to reason. Their answer may have validity as far as the content of those values are concerned. What the good is or what to believe concerning self, humanity or God may be derived either from revelation or reason. But the source of the imperative character of the one and of the endorsement character of the other lies elsewhere than their content. That source is in the will to salvation which invests all its interests with its own vitality which in the ethical (formal) values takes on the character of urge (imperative) and in the spiritual (final values) takes on the character of (p.214) (endorsement).

The foregoing enables us both to see the element of truth in the contention of M. Guyan in his "A Sketch of Morality Independent of Obligation or

Sanction" and to qualify that contention properly. He maintains that morality is "a ~~maxim~~ natural internal energy for good translating itself into action by its own exuberance of vitality" and not "an outer law of restraint which incessantly struggles with an unwilling ~~individual~~ individual." He is right in maintaining that neither the moral law nor religious belief is what makes men moral. We must look for the source of morality to the very nature of the human will to live. But that does not mean that we can depend upon the human will to live or man's exuberant vitality as such to give us the knowledge of the good or the faith in God. These come from the formal and final interests respectively.

* * * *

Sunday, November 23, 1941

By the same token we should trace to the will to salvation as the material cause of salvation the roots of the final interests which become articulate in the final values: God, humanity and personality. The will to salvation is the conative aspect of self-awareness. The latter, especially in those endowed with an extra measure of it (the Kohen or the prophet) brings into sharp relief the contrast between the frailty of the human being and the overwhelming power of the environing world of things. All power is a threat to frailty. The awareness of the contrast between self and not self is inherently frightening. This is identified by Rudolf Otto as the experience of the ~~ominous~~ ^{numinous}. It carries with it a fear of potential destructiveness of the not-self. But the will to salvation cannot abide in a state of fright which is paralyzing. By a sheer tour de force it decrees as it were that the not-self, far from being destructive is in rapport with itself. With every moment that the will survives it is strengthened in this assumption. This ambivalent attitude toward the not-self carries over into the final (spiritual) interest giving rise to fear and love of God and to fear and love of society.

* * * *

Saturday, November 29, 1941

Last night we had with us Dr. and Mrs. Max Schlesinger for dinner. Dr. Schlesinger is, I believe of Dutch Jewish origin. He was a fellow student of Magnes when the latter was taking post graduate courses in Berlin University which (I

think) was between 1897 and 1900. Like Magnes, Schlesinger became an instructor at Hebrew Union College about 1901. After two or three years' stay in that institution an anti-Zionist storm broke out there and it swept both Max Margolis and Max Schlesinger. Schlesinger went into the business which seemed to have been that of his family, namely the manufacture of sausage casings, and apparently amassed considerable wealth. When in the early thirties Magnes began to have his trouble in the University, Schlesinger decided to move to Jerusalem and to come to Magnes' assistance by helping him in his administrative duties.

Now follows the story which Schlesinger told us at dinner table last night. In 1934 the committee consisting of Albert Einstein, Prof. Louis Ginzberg and Sir Philip Hartog of England made a study of the administration of the University and prepared a report for the meeting of the Board of Governors which took place in July of that year at Zurich and at which Cyrus Adler presided. Among the recommendations was one that in view of the infrequency of the meetings of the Board of Governors -- only once in two years -- an Executive Council consisting of members living in Palestine ~~be~~ be appointed. That Council was to meet often and to deal with all problems of administration. When it came to naming the members who were to serve on that Council, Schlesinger's name was among them. At this point Philip Hartog rose and objected to Schlesinger's name being included. He said he had authoritative information to the effect that Schlesinger had proposed to offer honorary degrees to people who would contribute \$1000 to the University. One who had so little understanding of and regard for the dignity of a University was unfit to serve on the Board. Schlesinger was present at the meeting when this was said.

Magnes came to Schlesinger's defense and said there must be some misunderstanding. After some heated discussion, it was decided to appoint ~~six persons~~ a court of honor consisting of Supreme Court Judge Greenbaum of South Africa, Judge ~~Frank~~ Fromkin of Jerusalem and Stephen S. Wise. The court met that night. When Hartog was asked to repeat his charges against Schlesinger he asked whether Schlesinger could sue either him or the one who reported to him for libel. When Schlesinger replied that he would not want under any circumstances to drag the University

into any litigation Hartog took out a letter which he had received from Louis Ginzberg and which had been the basis of his objection to Schlesinger's appointment on the Executive Council.

Schlesinger then explained to the court what was behind that letter. A wealthy Jew in Holland who was a member of the Dutch senate and a great scholar besides, was gotten interestd in the Hebrew University and was made a member of the Board of Governors. When he was approaching his 70th birthday his secretary wrote to Schlesinger that his family would highly appreciate the University's awarding him an honorary degree and they would express their appreciation by making a considerable grant to the University. Schlesinger, acting on Magnes' advice, replied to the secretary that the University had not yet granted any honorary degree, and that the matter would have to be referred to the Board of Governors at its next meeting. At the same time Schlesinger asked the secretary to let him have some idea of what the family of the senator was prepared to do for the University. (The University was very hard up for money at the time, and Magnes and he were hoping that such a grant might help them out from their difficulties.) This meeting was the one at which the question was to have been brought ~~Yup~~ up. But before it had a chance to come up Hartog came out with his allegation ~~against~~ against Schlesinger.

The next day Schlesinger was vindicated in the statement by Judge Greenbaum who said that Hartog had based his accusation on misinformation which he had received. Hartog then apologized. The entire incident affected Schlesinger's health which has not been good since then.

I had met Schlesinger quite frequently during my stay in Jerusalem, but he never told me of this experience of his, although Ginzberg's name came up a number of times in our conversation. This story came out last night when I told Schlesinger of Ginzberg's campaign against me. Schlesinger said this letter of Ginzberg's was written after he had received personal assurance from Ginzberg of warm friendship. Magnes was included in those assurances. I myself can testify to the insincerity of those assurances with regard to Magnes, whom he belittled in a conversation at my house when he visited us shortly after his return from Palestine. It is hardly possible that Hartog should not have informed Ginzberg of what happened, but never

has a word of explanation or apology come from the great infallible Ginzberg.

What an unfortunate people we Jews are! That men of such low spiritual calibre as Ginzberg and Finkelstein should have the power to thwart any move that might augment the will of our people to live and to make the most of its life!

Today I received a note from Milton Steinberg enclosing a letter from Armand Cohen of Cleveland to him. In that letter Cohen calls upon him, and through him apparently also on me, "to make an eleventh hour effort to bring together all who should naturally be concerned with saving Judaism in America." He still has hopes of convincing Finkelstein and the other Seminary authorities that they ought to take a leading part in the preservation of Judaism, and he thinks Milton Steinberg, I, Eugene Kohn, Eisenstein, Israel Leventhal and Louis ~~Ep~~ Epstein ought to do the convincing. And that after having received the following letter from Finkelstein which reads in part as follows: "You spoke last summer and you write now of the need of some kind of radical surgery. I definitely think that something important has to be done. Also, having given the matter a good deal of consideration, I feel that it is necessary for a small group of us to meet and think through the various suggestions and plans which have been made.

"Milton Steinberg said something to me the other day very similar to what you write. I would indeed be glad to confer with you and him and anyone else who is interested in the whole problem of bringing about stronger Judaism in this country. I cannot, however, take the initiative in such an effort because I will at once be accused of seeking a controversy. The Seminary has a great many tasks to perform which are of vital importance and are receiving continually increasing appreciation and cooperation from the most diverse groups. We cannot waste our energies in futile recriminations within our group. If you can find some way in which the other members of the faculty and I can help without appearing to be presumptuous I should be deeply grateful."

In case we cannot effect any working arrangement with the Seminary, Armand Cohen says "then by all means full steam ahead to the Reconstructionist effort."

What he means by that is very difficult to say, because in the same letter he suggests some grandiose scheme of establishing an ~~interpretatix~~ interpartisan Actions Committee consisting of Seminary, Reconstructionists and the Central Conference. That committee should work out among other things an educational program along the lines of a program he himself has worked out and which he appended to his letter. In that program he proposes as the first measure "standardization of hours with a view to a minimum of four days a week in all Jewish schools."

This utopian proposal of a four day a week school comes after a heart rendering description of how uninterested Jews are in Judaism and how eager they are to get away from it. Cohen is all mixed up, Finkelstein is evasive, Leventhal and Epstein are hopelessly impossible in that they either deny the very existence of any inner problem in Jewish life, or have no comprehension of it. So it all reduces itself once again to Eugene, Ira, Milton and myself, and not one of us is either a Jesus or a Hitler in leadership capacity.

Chapter III

In a descriptive science dealing with any phase of life subhuman or human the object of study has to be treated genetically. But in a normative science the object of study has to be treated teleologically. Soterics, as the study of the problem of what should be done to achieve salvation, is a normative science. We should not begin with the study of the functional interests to discover how, in the course of their being satisfied, man comes to reckon with the rational (formal) and spiritual (final) interests. Instead we should first study the nature and content of the final interests. Before we can ascertain how man goes about achieving salvation we have to know what are the very standards by which he determines what salvation is.

There are two types of standards: spiritual and rational. We evaluate a house from the standpoint of whether it is intended to be a home or a warehouse, and from the standpoint of its architectural form. It is apparent that the purpose is logically prior to the form. Hence in soterics we must first treat of the spiritual interests.

2. The spiritual interests may be subsumed under the following values (objects which satisfy them): God, humanity and personality. These values, in one form or another, are present in all human experience viewed from the standpoint of salvation. They are never deliberate inferences but always data and therefore to be considered as a priori. What Aristotle says about the first principles of ethics applies also to the spiritual values which are the first principles of religion. They do not evolve out of the striving for salvation, any more than a destination evolves out of the process of walking. They do not even evolve out of the rational interests and can never be a substitute for them, any more than the destination can be derived from or identified with the compass or map by means of which we check up the progress we are making to the destination.

3. The values: God, humanity and personality, are correlative in character, i.e. they have no meaning apart from the functional and the rational values (vertically). They are likewise correlative in respect to one another (horizontally). The first fact exposes the fallacy of the ontological (philosophical) approach to those values; the second enables us to see in a new light the meaning of philosophical mysticism.

As final values God, humanity and personality articulate man's destiny for the sake of which man must live in order to make the most of his life. He must live simultaneously for God, for humanity and for personality, in the sense that their very reality is meaningless to him apart from the extent to which he lives for them.

4. What these values signify depends upon the manner in which (1) salvation is conceived and (2) the means to it formulated. The following is a summary of the different stages of human behavior as reflected in man's striving for salvation:

Tuesday, December 2, 1941

| <u>Spiritual values</u> | <u>Means of Salvation</u> | <u>Nature of Salvation</u> |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Spirits and gods | Theurgic (conscious) + soteric (unconscious) | Security against disease privation, enemies |
| Emergence of group god | Theurgic + soteric (both conscious) | Security for individ- ual and group |
| Emergence of universal god | Divinely revealed law | Security + group expansion |

| Spiritual values | Means of Salvation | Nature of Salvation |
|---|--|---|
| Universal God as redeemer | Self-identification with God | Individual redemption from sin and death (otherworldliness) |
| ? | Knowledge of the right translated into habits | Ethical personality |
| God as immanent and transcendent Power that makes for salvation | Knowledge of rational and functional values translated into individual habits and attitudes and into social institutions and ideals. | Growth individual and collective |

5. One of the common evils which attend spiritual values and their expression in doctrine and practice is the failure of "referring them to the reality of common experience or to the realities of actual life." Since the spiritual values intrinsically involve a reference, the tendency in traditional religion has been to refer these values "away from the world of common experience to one which is not experienced but only imagined." Thus arose the idea of other-worldliness. Yet this world and the functional and rational interests which constituted it would not be left completely devoid of spiritual values.

Accordingly, men have been uncertain in which world the spiritual values were to be realized, in the one of empirical experience or in the one affirmed in the traditional theologies. To the extent that traditional religion controlled the conduct of men and nations it could not but have the spiritual values serve as symbols of what was to be made of this-worldly affairs. But since this function of the spiritual values was not fostered deliberately, but rather through sheer necessity, it was carried out superficially without reaching out to the intricate details of human behavior. With the spiritual values thus referring simultaneously to two worlds radically unlike each other, man has labored under uncertainty as to which world is to be the scene of his salvation, and has made a failure of both worlds.

In this connection, the following from John Macmurrays' "The Structure of Religious Experience" (pp. 61-68) is extremely illuminating: "If the two worlds of reference...."to use a phrase which Professor Whitehead has given currency.

Friday, December 5, 1941

This week I delivered the first two out of town lectures this year secured for me by the Jewish Welfare Board Lecture Bureau. The first one was delivered on Monday night at Lynn, Mass., the second at Pottsville, Penn. The Lynn lecture was given under the auspices of the YMHA center of which Wm. M. Pruss is Executive Director. I had asked Miss Weiman of the Lecture Bureau to send out a letter to those who have made arrangements for me to lecture at their institutions to let me know what phases of the subjects they chose they wanted me to discuss, and if possible to send me a number of specific questions they wanted me to answer. Pruss was very helpful in this respect. He prepared the following list of questions: 1. Is the interpretation of Judaism dependent upon the economic status of the individual? 2. Can assimilation be an answer in the elimination of anti-Semitism? 3. What is the present trend in Judaism? Is synagogue membership decreasing? Is orthodoxy or reform making headway or losing ground? 4. Is strict observance of traditional Judaism possible today? 5. Would the establishment of a Jewish hierarchy, after the Roman Catholic pattern be beneficial? The subject on which I had been asked to speak was "Traditional Judaism and Its Reinterpretation." In the light of those questions I was able to treat this subject as an invitation to discuss the Reconstructionist program.

* * * *

Saturday, December 6, 1941

Additional information furnished me by Mr. Pruss dealt with the general character of the Jewish community in Lynn. "Our community," he wrote, "has a history of nearly 50 years, with the oldest organized congregation just about to observe its 40th anniversary. Our own center (YMHA) is now in its 31st year. We have a Jewish population between 7000 and 7500. We have every possible form of Jewish organization, with approximately 40 presidents. There are four orthodox synagogues and a conservative temple with Rabbi Israel Harburg as the spiritual leader. Recently we incorporated a welfare federation, which takes in local and non-local organizations in one annual fund raising drive. In this local organization all strata of the com-

munity have representation, and I am pleased to state that up to date there exists a strong spirit of harmony in our community."

Pruss and his wife met me at the station at Boston and drove me to Lynn. On the way I asked him more details about the community. I learned that only about 20% of the Jewish population are affiliated with the synagogue, that there is only one orthodox rabbi who has to be supported from private contributions, that Harburg, a graduate of Hebrew Union College, is the only functioning rabbi in town and that only about 250 children, mostly boys, attend a communal Talmud Torah.

Rabbi Harburg introduced himself to me and later to the audience to whom he presented me as influenced in his rabbinical work by what he had read of my writings. He said that I had anticipated logically what had become necessary through the force of events. He had reference particularly to the tendency of Jewish life to gravitate toward the communal form of organization. In speaking to me he mentioned the group of about 30 rabbis from Boston and environs, of all ~~xxx~~ shades of opinion, who meet once a month and discuss their common problems in a spirit of perfect harmony. When I asked him why in a group of that kind very little is said or done to meet the basic problems of Jewish life that call for thoroughgoing reconstruction, he answered that the rabbis were so preoccupied with holding together the particular congregations which they head that they have no time or energy left for the larger problems of Jewish life.

The audience I addressed consisted of about 150 men and women. There were questions from the floor. Its a rough guess on the basis of those questions and of the general attitude of the audience I would say that the people were somewhat taken aback by the outspoken appeal to reconstruct the Jewish tradition, but were inclined to be sympathetic toward me because of my strong emphasis on Palestine.

My second lecture was given at Pottsville, Penn. In answer to inquiry Rabbi Jacob Hochman, who was responsible for my invitation to speak in his synagogue, wrote the following about the Jewish community in Pottsville: "Our community is made up of about 180 families. Of these the elder portion had its origin in Eastern Europe;

The majority, however, consists of younger people who were born in this country. The latter group will constitute the bulk of your audience. Their general education in the main is limited to high school. Many of them derive their living from merchandising."

"Our congregation (Oheab Zedek Cong) -- the only one in the city -- was established in 1856 by German Jews. It was taken over some 40 years ago by the later Eastern immigrants and it then became an 'Orthodox shul.'" I am the first American trained rabbi to serve the community and I came here two years ago. The local people turned to the Seminary for rabbinical leadership because there was dissatisfaction among the younger element with the European approach to the ordering of Jewish life.

Our people are not learned Jews, nor are they observant Jews. Except for a handful of older gentlemen none observe the Sabbath. Very many have broken with dietary observance in the home. Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur, Kaddish, Yahrzeit retain their hold but leave the people with no deep feeling.

"Our people are conscious of their Jewishness and want to be Jewish, but the old 'beliefs' and 'forms' leave them unresponsive. They want a presentation of Judaism -- though they are not explicit -- that will be vital, significant, inspiring. It is to offer them that that I have arranged your visit."

There were about 275 people in the audience, including a few Gentiles, mostly ministers. One of them told me after the lecture that he had come all the way from X which is 30 miles distant, in spite of the heavy fog which made driving quite risky. The audience on the whole was less Jewish in feeling than the one I had addressed in Lynn. After the lecture both Rabbi Hochman and I were asked by Mr. & Mrs. Michael Hanan to their home, where we stayed till 1,00 A.M. discussing the steps necessary to give Reconstructionism greater organizational impetus. At Mr. Hanan's request I took a later train back to N.Y. the next morning in order to meet an interesting friend of his a Mr. Dunn who had also been present at the lectures. The four of us including Rabbi Hochman met for breakfast and discussed various matters pertaining to Judaism. This Mr. Dunn, who was born in Swenziany, my native town in Russia, was until recently a communist, but has of late become interested in Jewish life and has joined the synagogue.

When I was through discussing with them I was convinced in my own mind that the next step to take was to ask the congregations which are at present affiliated with the United Synagogue, and which are thoroughly dissatisfied with it, to organize themselves into a Union of Jewish Reconstructionist Congregations. The idea struck me as being fully feasible, and I was quite elated at having found at last a way of spreading the movement. I was in that elated mood when I boarded the Penn. train at N. Philadelphia where a young man by the name of Sidney Asofsky introduced himself to me as a JIR graduate and at present a rabbi at Bloomfield, N.J. He was telling me that his is one of six congregations that are planning to form themselves into a sort of Kehillah. He had gotten his inspiration to organize a Kehillah from my "Judaism As a Civilization." When I asked him about the rabbis of those congregations he told me that four of them were headed by "freelances." Not even that fact deterred me from blurting out my idea about forming a national Union of Reconstructionist Congregations. Asofsky suggested that the time was not ripe for a national union, and that it would be best to form local units first. I was won over to his idea and promised to help with his undertaking.

As soon as I came home I had Ira come to see me and I told him about my new enthusiasm. After listening calmly to my plan he riddled it to bits. He pointed out very correctly that on the one hand the United Synagogue while too dead to accomplish anything would come to life through the opposition it would muster against Reconstructionist effort, and secondly this plan would confine Reconstructionism not only to the synagogue but to one branch of the synaogogue. I saw immediately that he was right, and I dropped the idea even more readily than I adopted it.

Nevertheless I am still troubled by the fact that we cannot expect to make any dent on Jewish life so long as we are merely a bi-weekly magazine with a circulation of 2000. I had been thinking for some time about the possibility of forming a fraternal order like the B'nai B'rith to promulgate Reconstructionism. I have now come back to that plan and expect to place it before the Editorial Board next Thursday night.

Sunday, December 7, 1941

When I was through teaching at the Institute this evening at 5:00 one of the students told me he had just heard over the radio that Japan had bombarded Manila and had declared war against our country. God knows what is in store for us. Now is the time to be prepared for the worst and to hope for the best.

* * * *

Monday, December 8, 1941

It now turns out that it was Hawaii (Pearl Harbor) that was attacked yesterday and not Manila. The latter city was raided this morning.

After lecturing the first hour at the Seminary this morning on Soterics, I was approached by a student with the request that, instead of taking up the Midrash during the second hour I say something about the article by Judge Jerome Frank, which appeared in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and by another student that I say something about the war between Japan and the U.S. Although I knew very well that the requests were prompted mainly by the desire to know what to say to those whom they would have occasion to address at the coming Friday night services I acceded to their wishes. Fortunately I had given some thought to the article by Jerome Frank. In fact I used its contents as a jumping off base for my talk last week at Pottsville, and I was even contemplating writing a reply to it. Although I did not have my notes before me I recollected enough of what I had planned to say that I was able to give the men a rather lengthy statement on the subject. As I warmed up to the theme I found myself formulating an idea which served as a natural transition to the discussion of our entry into the war. The idea was the following: Frank as an assimilationist Jew takes the position (in his article entitled "The Red-White-and Blue Herring) that Jews in coming here must sever all connections with their fellow-Jews as a group, either here or abroad, in order to be 100 percent loyal to America. This assumption is in keeping with the general pattern of thinking American isolationists one of whom Frank confesses himself to be. He merely applies the same principle of selfishness that makes him indifferent to and irresponsible

for his fellow-Jews as members of a group also to international relations. This policy of American isolationists which has prevented America from interfering with the international banditry that strong nations were perpetrating upon weak nations is one of the contributing factors to our present world tragedy. This policy is that of Cain who could not see why he should be expected to be his brother's keeper. By the same token that a man like Frank acts selfishly toward his fellow-Jews, he acts as an American and would have all Americans act toward other nations.

I concluded my closing session a few minutes before the regular time so that the students should not miss listening in on the radio at 12:30 at which time the President was expected to address Congress and to call upon them to declare war against Japan. The students went to the students' lounge and I went to Greenberg and Charry's room to hear the address which was very brief and to the point.

* * * *

Wednesday, December 10, 1941

Last night we had the first of the evening meetings of the Reconstructionist Editorial Board, which we had been wanting to hold for the longest time but which we had to put off from week to week because it interfered with one or another's schedule. Those present were Ira, Eugene Kohn, Milton Steinberg, Abe Duker, The. N. Lewis, Bernard Heller, Sam Dinin, Israel S. Chipkin, Mrs. Grossman and I.

I had asked a young man Eli Jaffe (27) of Oklahoma and now of Brooklyn ~~to~~ to come and present his case to the group. He has been sentenced to ten year's state prison and \$5000 fine for being a communist. That being a communist rendered one guilty of criminal (?p.224) was argued by the county attorney on the ground of the communist literature found in his possession. He was one of four who were sentenced on these grounds. They are at present out on bail and are being enabled principally by the International Labor Defense, a communist organization to appeal to the higher courts. The entire matter had been called to my attention by Mrs. Guggenheimer a former friend of Mrs. Lindheim. She had introduced this Jaffe, a young Jewish journalist, and I had him come before our group in the hope that he might interest them in the so-called "Oklahoma Witch Hunt." Duker and Dinin who

who are somewhat familiar with the tortuous workings of the communists identified the International Labor Defense as being communist. We therefore made it clear to Jaffe that we could work only through the Civil Liberties League, whom we shall ask in what we could be of help in this matter.

After that I discussed the editorials which have to be written up for the coming issue of the Reconstructionist. The outbreak of the war with Japan demanded that we have something to say about it in next week's issue.

The main subject of the evening's discussion was the idea of organizing a Reconstructionist Order or as it later developed a Reconstructionist Fellowship to be known as The Religious Fellowship of Jewish Reconstructionists. After realizing that we could not expect to make much headway with our movement if we were content to remain a kind of esoteric school of thought, and that we would waste our energy in polemics if we were to set up as a rival to any of the existing denominations, I came to the conclusion that the organizational framework most suited to our purpose was that of a lay religious order or fellowship. The suggestion met with approval from most of those present. Chipkin was virtually the only doubting Thomas.

As I envisage the Fellowship it would develop along the following lines: To begin with we would have to formulate the specific regimen of principles and duties to which a member of such a Fellowship would have to dedicate himself. They would have to be principles and duties relating to his personal life and conduct. We would have to find at least a "minyan" persons from among our own group to constitute themselves the first chapter. This chapter would then contact individuals who with the assistance of one or two of their close friends could organize "minyanim" or chapters from among their acquaintances. The procedure of Ahad HaAm's "Bne Moshe" might be followed in our case, except that it could not afford to confine itself as that fellowship did to a few very select people. It would have to be more inclusive and democratic seeking to elicit devotion to Judaism in lay people willing to lead Jewish lives and to bring up their children as Jews, instead of assuming a highly developed interest as already present.

Tonight I spoke at Rabbi Schorr's synagogue in the Bronx on "The Reconstructionist Movement." The one who introduced me was a Mr. Plumer who is the chairman of the adult study and lecture courses. At first I was non-plussed at the apparently bizarre character of the audience from the standpoint of Reconstructionism. But as I proceeded I seemed to notice a genuine interest in what I was saying. My speaking was part of a plan to hold three lecture institutes in various communities in and out of town. I doubt however whether anything will come of these efforts.

* * * *

Friday, December 12, 1941

Yesterday Germany and Italy declared war against our country and our country is at last united on the only course that will save the world from the desperadoes who have gotten a strangle hold on it. No one expects that we should interrupt our normal pursuits or stop meeting our normal needs, because we are at war. It is otherwise with activities of a cultural and spiritual character. Many of our people who have felt some obligation to engage in such activities are only too glad to find an excuse for placing a moratorium on them at this time. They are even ready to regard the blackout of Jewish interests as a patriotic duty. Fortunately President Roosevelt in his address last Tuesday night -- for which our Reconstructionist group suspended its discussions to listen to -- said something which is a charter for carrying on our Jewish life. "And I am sure," he said, "that the people in every part of the nation are prepared in their individual living to win the war...I am sure that they will cheerfully give up those material things that they are asked to give up. And I am sure that they will retain all those great spiritual things without which we cannot win through."

I used the foregoing as my opening text in my talk last Wednesday night and last night. Last night I presented Reconstructionism to a small group of people at the home of Mr. Doniger, who lives in the same apartment house that we do. One would ~~may~~ imagine that when people accept an invitation to meet me and to hear me discuss Reconstructionism they are at least vitally concerned in the conservation of Jewish life, and that the discussion would turn upon the question how it may best be achieved

Instead of which they would like me to prove to them why we should remain Jews. And when I succeed in diverting them from that question to the question: How? they take a critically negative attitude. When I give them the general purposes to which we must dedicate ourselves they complain that those purposes are too general. When I detail a list of specific activities they find fault with this or that detail. I nearly lost my temper but managed to hold myself back. What I did say was that we are not coming to them with a supernatural revelation. We merely propose certain general purposes and ask those who are interested in remaining Jews to make the reconstruction of Jewish life and thought their problem and responsibility. If they do not care enough about Judaism to realize that it is as much their problem as ours, nothing that we say or do is of any avail.

Among those present at the meeting last night was a man in the thirties by the name of Joshua Lieberman. He has been conducting a summer camp for the last few years, and now he is, in addition, working with ~~Dushkin~~ Dushkin in directing the Jewish education of children of parents who have become estranged from Jewish life, but who want their children to have some kind of intelligible Jewish orientation. Just what kind of orientation they want they themselves don't know. They object to its being either Jewishly religious or national. The nearest to what they want might be designated by the term "cultural."

Lieberman told me how he came to be asked to direct these childrens' groups. About a year and a half ago he happened to suggest to Dushkin the need of working out a Jewish curriculum of studies for children so that when they begin to think for themselves they would not want to disgorge what they had learned. About a year ago Dushkin called him and told him that a number of members of the Jewish Education Committee -- Willen, Alan Stroock, Hexter, Ed. Warburg and one or two more -- threatened to resign from the Committee because it made no provision for the kind of Jewish education which they would want their children to receive. In view of what Lieberman had told him, he wanted Lieberman to take charge of that problem and find a solution. It seems that Lieberman has managed to organize a few groups of such children. They are being given a sort of semi-private Jewish schooling according

to a special curriculum which he has worked out for them. Among other things he is having Miss Mintzovit teach them arts and crafts and he has called in Judith to give them Jewish music.

The following is what he said about the men who had threatened to resign from the JEC. Willen vacillates between the desire to break with Jewish life and the desire to find it worthwhile. He is really undergoing inner spiritual conflict. Alan Stroock has a streak of deep religiosity. Hexter hates Judaism. Ed Warburg who married a gentile woman, and is a full time worker in Jewish philanthropies, complains against his father for having sent him to the Essex School and then to Harvard instead of having brought him in New York and having sent him to Columbia. He claims that the education which he received taught him to find gentile life and associations deeply satisfying. After having been given such an education, his father paradoxically thrust him into Jewish activities. Edward is especially resentful of his grandfather, the late Jacob H. Schiff, who did the most irrational things (?) in the name of religion to impress upon his grandchildren the importance of religion.

I have just come from Rodeph Sholom Temple of West 83 St. where I spoke on "What Jews Need Most Today" before a group of about 175 people of Louis I. Newman's congregation. This was the first time he tried out a kind of "Oneg Shabbat" gathering for the purpose of infusing in his people something of the Sabbath spirit which is probably lacking in their homes.

That Temple was among the first to introduce Friday night services. I recall the days when I was a student at the old Seminary which was housed in a brownstone private house at 736 Lexington Ave. For about two years (1896-8) I lived in the dormitory which consisted of the top floor. On Friday nights we used to attend services in what was then the Rodeph Sholom Temple on cor. Lexington Ave. and 63 St. It was originally a church and it had all the beauty and comfort of a church. Rev. Dr. Rudolph Grossman was the rabbi. He was a little pale faced man who pronounced his r's like w's. He was therefore known as Wudolph Grossman. Before coming to the Temple he had been Kohler's assistant at Temple Beth El where he used to officiate without a hat. But when he came to Rodoph Sholom he had to don a kind of episcopal h

